

NON-ALIGNMENT LEGACY OF NEHRU

MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY



89455CL

SHASHI BHUSHAN, M.P.



PROGRESSIVE PEOPLES SECTOR PUBLICATIONS (PVT) LTD.

Released in June, 1976

V2, 21:19(ZK)

L6

89455

© Progressive Peoples Sector Publications (Pvt) Ltd.

Price : Rs. 40.00

Published by Progressive Peoples Sector Publications (Pvt) Ltd.
216, Hans Bhavan, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110001
Printed at Rajendra Ravindra Printers (Pvt) Ltd, New Delhi-110055

*In the memory of
V K Krishna Menon
who
promoted the concept of
non alignment and dedicated
his life for world peace*

Contents

Preface	..	7
Acknowledgements		16
I Basis of India's Foreign Policy		17
II A New Asian Era at Bandung		35
III The Renegade of Bandung Spirit		50
IV Non Alignment Evolution and Progress		56
V Non Alignment to Safeguard Against Imperialism		64
VI Summits From Belgrade to Algiers		86
VII The Fall of Colonialism		104
VIII Towards International Detente		116
IX Economic Independence and Cooperation Among Nations		134
X Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace		146
XI Coexistence for Peace and Security in Asia		169
XII Enemies of Non Alignment		195
XIII Prospects and Perspectives		217

Preface

The name of Jawaharlal Nehru is dear to all of us. We remember how heroically he led our struggle for freedom against a mighty colonial power. We remember how he galvanised the entire nation from east to west from north to south. The freedom movement, which finally triumphed in the transfer of power, embraced the entire nation.

Nehru took the reins of power in the travails of partition amidst the agony of millions. Healing their wounds rendering succour to them, he never lost sight of the picture of a new India he had drawn before the people. An industrialised India freed from the backwardness of the past delivered from the shackles of a medieval economy—such was the vision of the land he had started rebuilding.

He had thought of this new India not only in terms of its geographical boundaries but as part of this wide world of ours shrunk into compactness into a kind of oneness brought about by new historical processes. All through the freedom struggle he had fired our imagination with the prospects of linking our fate with that of fellow Asians with the progressive forces the world over

Freedom came to us when the cold war had already descended upon the world. The embers of the cold war had just died out when calls for a new holocaust were given when the West indulged in sabre rattling. The talk of military blocs in Europe America and Asia was in the air. Our erstwhile colonial power in collusion with the United States was in the forefront of this confrontation with socialist countries

Jawaharlal Nehru had the deepest conviction that India could not rebuild itself on modern lines if a war overtook the world, eating up its vast resources—men, money and material. Besides, he had too sensitive a heart to remain unaffected by the appearance of deadly nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.

As Prime Minister of free India, he formulated a foreign policy which could answer the needs of the time to keep the cold war outside the country's frontiers, prevent its entanglement in aggressive military pacts, and advance the cause of peace in Asia and throughout the world. Nehru was a statesman with his feet firmly planted in the soil of his land. He had a great vision. He saw that in the prevailing international situation the only salvation for India lay in keeping itself away from military pacts and groupings, and in remaining non-aligned.

Jawaharlal Nehru is rightly hailed as the pioneer of non-alignment, as its principal architect. He took the lead in enunciating this policy for the emerging Afro-Asian nations which needed peace for their national advance after centuries of colonial servitude. The role he played at Bandung is written in letters of gold.

Jawaharlal Nehru's policy of non-alignment, translated in the West as "immoral", won adherents in the Afro-Asian community, in Europe and even in Latin America. Non-alignment no longer remained a mere concept, it developed into a widespread movement dedicated to the principles enshrined in the historic Panchsheel. These principles were drawn not as a matter of expediency but as a guide to the newly liberated countries in conducting their international affairs.

The movement of non-alignment which had 25 countries at the Belgrade summit now embraces 82 nations, big and small. A redeeming feature of the movement is that it has ceased to be merely a political one. Its horizons now extend to economic cooperation, more especially among

the deprived nations which suffered at the hands of the colonialists for centuries The avowed aim underlying the movement is to remove economic disparities between the rich and the poor nations, between developed and the developing nations. Writing in Socialist India, in its Independence Day number of 1975, Shri Y B Chavan, Union Minister of External Affairs, said: "If in the fifties and sixties the main thrust of non alignment was against the division of the world into two cold war camps endangering world peace as well as the independence of countries, today it is directed against the iniquitous and explosive division of the world into the developed and the developing nations) To narrow and eventually to bridge this gap and to establish balanced and cooperative relationship between the developed and developing worlds is a principal objective of non alignment The establishment of a just economic balance between these two categories of nations is essential not only from the point of social justice and human equality but for the creation of peaceful and stable world order free from the threat of violent upheavals"

Racial discrimination prevails in its worst form even today in some parts of the world Apart from South Africa and Rhodesia, the U K where a sizable Afro Asian community lives, is in the fore in discriminating against the coloured at the time of writing this preface A politically motivated segment of public opinion in the U K blindly supports the whole sale ouster of the coloured immigrant community from that country The racial hatred generated by the irresponsible utterances of some fascists and racialists in that country in the past few days leave us in no doubt about the imminent danger to the Afro-Asian settlers The persistence of racialism in Africa and other parts of the world is an outrage on humanity Speaking in the Third Conference of Non aligned countries in Lusaka, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, said

We have all been subjected to domination, exploitation

and the humiliation of racial discrimination. How could we compromise with racialism in any form? The pernicious theory that one man is superior to another merely on the ground of race or birth has been proved to be false, yet it continues to dominate the thinking of many” The non alignment movement strongly deprecates this inflammation of the racial feelings

“The non alignment movement, though its nomenclature suggests a negative meaning, has a positive connotation as remarked by Jawaharlal Nehru in his address at the conference of non aligned nations at Belgrade” He said “nations which object to this lining up for war purposes military blocs, military alliances and the like. Therefore we keep away from this and we want to throw our weight, such as it is, in favour of peace. In effect, therefore, when there is a crisis involving the possibility of war, the very fact that we are unaligned should stir us to action, should stir us to thought, should stir us to feel that now more than ever it is up to us to do whatever we can to prevent such a calamity coming down upon us. So from every point of view of our inception and being as modern nations, this problem is dominantly before us. I lay stress on this because, since we are engaged with many other difficult problems which face us as a whole, which face us as individual countries—for all of us have problems—it is a little dangerous with this particular crisis that we might really repeat, I say so with all respect, all other problems we have before us and put this major problem in the background. That I think would be little short of a tragedy because we would have failed in our purpose, we would have failed to meet the demands made by humanity on us today when it is facing this crisis.” The positive role of this movement is solidarity among the nations for peace at large while resisting the existence of the military blocs.

The non alignment is perhaps the single most powerful

movement on the world political scene today The collective opinion it projects represents over a third of humanity In the United Nations, the countries of the non aligned movement, have a dominant voice and rightly have they dealt a serious blow to the imperialist powers which dominated the world body from its inception It appears that the imperialist countries themselves are overawed by the overwhelming presence of non aligned countries, a force of peace, in the UN They have, on many occasions before threatened to withdraw their financial commitment to the UN, endangering the continuance of UN seat at New York In such an event in future, no alternative will be left than to shift the UN seat to some non aligned country to uphold the ideals cherished in the U.N Charter The policies of the countries adhering to the concept based on panchsheel display in abundant measure the abiding faith in peace, friendship and co-operation among the nations of the world It is no exaggeration to say that the move itself was initiated to secure a world order free from hate tension and conflict

The non aligned countries have so far not made the movement an all pervasive, a need for which has been felt long ago. The message of the non aligned at various levels within the countries subscribing to the movement will further bring the nations closer and help ease tensions. The conference of students, journalists agriculturists youths and other groups among the non aligned countries would pave way for further harmony and amity among the countries.

Unlike the countries of the military blocs who impose themselves from above, the non aligned countries aim at working from within. They first achieve local balance and from there they step to neighbouring balance. After reaching these balances they seek to establish inter continental balance signifying systematic approach to world problems and ultimately ensuring success of their ideals.

There has been a mad arms race leading to the inventions

of new weapons of mass destruction and stockpiling them more so after the Second World War. The build up of vast reserve of destructive potential by some countries itself contributed to the increase in threat of war, besides enormously adding to the defence expenditure of these countries. The non aligned nations stand for disarmament and reduction in military budget of the countries. Their belief that the security and peace can be established through disarmament is not without foundations. Addressing the fourth conference of non aligned countries in Algiers, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said "Moves towards the limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction are important to the relaxation of tensions. But they do not take us far enough. The total elimination of nuclear weapons and complete disarmament alone can lead to genuine peace. Such disarmament calls for far greater courage and conviction than is now in evidence. We have lent our support to the proposed World Disarmament Conference in the hope that it will be able to generate the will and find a way." In fact it is largely true in the revised world context which calls for more prosperous world economic order.

It makes a painful reading that the major news media of the world are still controlled by the big monopoly houses having vested interests. The smaller nations especially those part of the non aligned movement should develop their own news media to counter the nefarious propaganda carried out by the imperialist controlled mass media. Such a move would accord a better status to the developing nations and they will develop a sense of equality with dominant partners in the world. This would also facilitate direct communication among the non aligned countries and would obviate this being routed through the imperialist agencies. The non aligned movement must receive fillip from such moves of these countries.

There is a danger to the non aligned movement from

countries who are playing in the hands of imperialists imperialist renegades and others who by their designed penetration into the movement aim at weakening it.

During the Second World War imperialist powers gave impetus to the fascist states so that they could effectively fight against socialist states. Because of this terrible folly committed by the democratic imperialists 20 million people lost their lives in the War. It is blasphemous that the 300 years old feudal democracy in Britain and 200 years old neo-imperialist democracy in America, are fanning up Chinese hegemonistic designs to create rift among the non aligned nations and to fight against the socialist states. The non aligned countries will realise that these imperialists and their allied forces had more than once brought the world to the brink of third world war. It is no less pernicious that these imperialist forces talk of detente on the one hand and promote arms race on the other.

The colonialists imposed the existing mode of education on most of the countries in the non aligned movement with the ulterior motive of disseminating their own ideas and culture. This system of education has outlived its utility if ever it had any and the non aligned nations should now lay increasing emphasis on this system being reoriented to suit local conditions and requirements. The new cultural invasion by the West on these countries is only diverting the mind of the youth from the constructive activity. The brain drain caused by the lure given to the nationals of these countries is depleting their national wealth. It is in the interest of the non aligned countries to stop their intelligentsia making their services available to the alien at a heavy cost of their own progress and prosperity.

Most of the countries adhering to the non-aligned movement have resolutely fought against colonialism and imperialism and have won their freedom throwing the colonial yoke. The oppression and exploitation suffered by them for centuries

have reduced them to penury for many years to come. While restructuring the fabric of their economy, they are striving for a new order based on social and economic justice. Some of the newly liberated countries like Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba and new applicant Angola have communist order. But in most of the other countries socialism is taking deep roots as it is marching ahead in India where it is going to be declared soon Democratic Secular Socialist Republic of India. The wave of democratic order is also besieging the other newly independent countries where through it social justice is to be established. The non-aligned countries are also unanimous in their opposition to setting up of military bases in the Indian Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Korean Sea and the Caribbean Sea. They staunchly oppose the interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Another area of unanimity can be seen in their strict adherence to the five principles of peaceful coexistence evolved at the Bandung meet. The countries of the non aligned movement vociferously oppose the fight between Arabs and Arabs and between Asians and Asians. It leaves us in no doubt that non alignment will survive all other military designs and it is fervently hoped that a day will dawn when the military blocs will disappear into the oblivion, never to be heard of again, for lasting peace in the world. This was also the underlying idea when non alignment was conceived. We are non aligned when destruction is intended but we are aligned for the cause of mutual development and world peace.

Non alignment has been described differently by its enemies. Tags came to be attached to it—of "neutrality", of "inaction", of "elitism". But what it really was intended to be and what it achieved in the realm of international affairs is not unknown to the students of current affairs. Many persons approach this problem purely from scholastic angles. This book is a humble attempt at understanding non alignment as Jawaharlal Nehru had conceived it at a

time when the world was dominated by colonial powers and when there was flexing of military muscles by the greatest power of the Western world having a craze for the formation of military blocs. It is also an attempt at tracing its evolution from its inception to this day when we live in a changed world where colonialism is on the verge of collapse where cold war has yielded place to detente and cooperation rather than confrontation is being sought after by the saner world.

Voices are heard—loud as well as subdued—that non alignment has lost its viability in the multipolar world where the two great powers have agreed to abandon the collision course and where peaceful coexistence has come to be recognised as the only alternative to a nuclear devastation. It would be the aim of this book to bring out the relevance of Nehru's non alignment in the post Nehru international era. In fact, an effort has been made to explain to the reader, both in this country as well as abroad why it is necessary and expedient today to strengthen non alignment for further stabilising world peace for making the emerging trend of detente irreversible?

May this book be a humble contribution to further more cohesiveness among the non aligned countries and in advancing mankind's cause for creating a world without tensions and war—a cause Nehru espoused with great fervour and passion till the last day of his life. May I also add that the views expressed in this book are mine and those of progressive and conscious people of non aligned world. The book is brought out on the eve of Colombo conference of non aligned countries to help create a world opinion for peace progress and cooperation.

Acknowledgements

My debts in writing this book are legion. Ever since my mind was occupied with the idea of writing this book, numerous friends associated themselves with it in one way or the other. The collection of material, the first big step in writing a book, could be made easy by the courtesy of External Publicity Division of the Union Ministry of External Affairs, whom I owe my first debt of gratitude. I am thankful to Shri S.K. Verma who read the proofs of the book. I also thank Shri Ramesh Mishra for going through the manuscript and for reading the proofs. I will be failing in my duty if I do not acknowledge the debt of Shri S. Kumar whose friendly association with the book introduced many last minute improvements. Last but not the least, Shri Daljit Sen Adel has also been of valuable assistance to me in making the book possible.

Shashu Bhushan

CHAPTER I

Basis of India's Foreign Policy

The parameters of India's foreign policy were broadly laid down by Jawaharlal Nehru long before independence. To him freedom was not only a triumph but also an opportunity. He saw in India's release from the colonial grip, not merely the end of alien domination, but also the beginning of an era full of promise for bringing about renaissance in the country. Post British India meant to him not merely an independent geo-political entity but a strong and powerful force in the international arena acting in concert with other similar forces for restructuring world affairs in the direction of global peace, equality among nations and justice for the people.

The foreign policy he evolved, as the architect of modern India, was rooted as much in the past traditions of the free dom struggle as in the visions of future he sought to shape as the leader of the nation. From the early days of his participation in the anti colonial struggle, led by Mahatma Gandhi, he had come to acquire a wider outlook and to him national ism was "a narrow and insufficient creed". Nehru taught the millions who drew inspiration from his thoughts and deeds that political freedom was essential not only in itself, but also as an essential pre requisite for building a modern society on socialist lines. Socialism is for me not merely an economic doctrine which I favour, he said in his Presidential Ad

dress at the Lucknow session of the Indian National Congress in 1936, "it is a vital creed which I hold with all my head and heart. I work for Indian independence because the nationalist in me cannot tolerate alien domination. I work for it even more because for me it is the inevitable step to social and economic changes. I should like the Congress to become a socialist organisation and to join the other forces in the world who are working for the new civilisation."

It was within this broad framework that Nehru tried to evolve a role for India on the world scene. He did not conceive it in isolation from the mainstream of world events. "India's struggle today is part of the great struggle which is going on all over the world for the emancipation of the oppressed," he wrote in his autobiography. "We cannot... separate it from the rest. What happens in India will affect the world and world events will change India's future," he added.

These perceptions had existed, though in a nascent form, in the earlier phase of our freedom movement. In the early twenties the khilafat movement swept the country. It opposed the attempts of the Entente imperialists, headed by Britain, to strangle the national movement of the Turkish people and to dismember their country. The movement was led by Gandhiji with the Ali Brothers taking a prominent part in it. In 1922 the Congress, in its annual session, adopted a resolution on sending a message of congratulation to the Turkish people on their victory over Anglo-Greek interventionists. The Congress adopted another resolution, in 1924, expressing India's solidarity with the national liberation struggle of the Egyptian people. Gandhiji expressed in *Young India* (1925), his strong admiration for the heroic struggle waged by the Rifis tribes against the Spanish and French colonialists. It was in 1928 that the great national organisation of our land passed the resolution declaring that the struggle of Indian people for freedom was part of the world wide struggle against imperialism.

An expression to this was given by Gandhiji in 1930 by meeting the Wafd leaders at Port Said while he was on his way to London. He discussed with them the common problems of the freedom movements of the peoples of India and Egypt. In the later half of the thirties the Congress pledged its support to the struggle of the Palestinian Arabs against Zionists and British colonialists.

This strain in the Indian freedom movement required a very distinct colour when Nehru assumed a still greater role on the national scene as heir to the Mahatma. He started playing an exceptionally important role in strengthening solidarity in Asia against colonial bondage and in establishing contacts with fellow freedom fighters of other Asian countries. The first step he took in this direction was to represent the Indian National Congress at the International Congress Against Imperialism held in Brussels in 1927 followed by a visit to the Soviet Union. The Brussels Congress was also attended by Ho Chi Minh, Mohammad Hatta and other veteran freedom fighters. The Congress adopted a manifesto addressed to all oppressed peoples and classes, calling upon them to fight jointly against colonialism. Nehru told the Brussels Congress in his inspiring speech that the emancipation of India would play an important role in abolishing the colonial rule all over Asia. It was at this conference that the decision was taken to set up an international organisation called the League Against Imperialism. Its Executive Committee included eminent leaders of freedom struggles of the Eastern peoples. Among them was Jawaharlal Nehru. The great Indian leader summed up the effect the deliberations of the Brussels Congress had on him in the following words: 'It was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism and joint deliberation and, where possible, joint action were desirable' (Autobiography).

Jawaharlal's interest in world events deepened with the

years While in prison, during 1932-33, he spent a good deal of time pondering over the events in other countries and seriously analysing the world situation as it had emerged after the crash of 1929 "India with her problems and struggles," he wrote, "became just a part of this mighty world drama, of the great struggle of political and economic forces that was going on everywhere, nationally and internationally"

Nehru's sympathies were entirely with the international progressive forces.

The appearance of the dark cloud of fascism on the world horizon horrified Nehru He looked upon it as a throw back to a barbarous age, as a total negation of human values, as a suppression of human personality and trampling of the dignity of man The Nazi order filled him with disgust and revulsion so much so that he rejected outright Mussolini's invitation to see him (March, 1936) He also declined the invitation to visit Nazi Germany "Instead I went to Czechoslovakia, that 'far away' country about which England's then Prime Minister knew so little" Nehru's hatred of fascism was deep rooted He saw the dangers it posed to Europe, to the world, to the entire humanity But he did not lose heart He declared in his Presidential Address at the Lucknow session of the Congress "To the progressive forces of the world, to those who stand for human freedom and the breaking of political and social bonds, we offer our full cooperation in their struggle against imperialism and fascist reaction, for we realise that our struggle is a common one."

As a gesture of solidarity with Spain, plunged into a civil war by fascism, Nehru personally visited this fortress of heroism and brought to its legendary defenders a word of cheer from their Indian brethren locked in a combat with British imperialism "The call for help has come to us from those sorely stricken people and we cannot remain silent to the appeal," he said in his Presidential Address at the Faizpur session of the Congress "I like to be at the storm centre

of life," he said when he visited the trenches of the Spanish civil war

Nehru also visited China after its invasion by Japanese militarists and pledged India's support to its struggle against aggression

The Congress followed this lead given by Nehru and between 1936 and 1939, extended its sympathy and support to all victims of fascism and imperialism in Abyssinia, Spain, China, Palestine (Arabs) and Czechoslovakia. This was, of course, a natural course to be followed by an organisation actively engaged in carrying on the struggle for independence against the greatest colonial power of the world

When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941, most Congress leaders including Nehru, were in prison. They had started a civil disobedience movement as a protest against the British refusal to declare India independent in spite of the Indian offer of full support to the war effort in return. Nehru took the first opportunity after his release from prison in the first week of December 1941, to laud the heroic struggle of the Soviet people and to declare soon after that the progressive forces of the world were aligned with the group represented by the Soviet Union and other anti Hitler powers

Acting largely upon his advice, the Working Committee of the Congress at its meeting at Bardoli in the last week of December 1941, took note of the new factors in the international situation

Nehru followed the course of the war with anxiety and he identified himself fully with the cause of anti fascism

Nehru strove for friendship and amity with all nations India as he said in an article in *Foreign Affairs* (April 1963) entered the family of independent nations with a clean slate without any inherited hatreds or territorial ambitions determined to cultivate friendly and cooperative relations with all countries. He had the abiding conviction that the world in spite of its rivalries and hatreds moved inevitably towards

closer cooperation. He stretched out his hand in friendship to all in the world even to those who traduced him. But he made it clear that this would not in any way dilute the principles on which independent India's foreign policy was based. These principles were dear to him to the country he led and to its people who had struggled for their fulfilment. In his broadcast of September 7, 1946 he said:

We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races. We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism wherever and in whatever form it may be practiced. We seek no domination over others and we claim no privileged position over other peoples. But we do claim equal and honourable treatment for our people wherever they may go and we cannot accept any discrimination against them."

He threw his entire weight and influence in ensuring that Asia and Africa were freed from the last vestiges of colonialism that racialism was ended and that the two continents took their legitimate place in the international community and marched ahead in step with the entire progressive humanity. It was for this reason that he participated in the first official conference of Asian countries at Bandung in 1955. The echo of his eloquent speech at the gathering of Asian representatives still reverberates in the entire continent.

"We are determined in this new phase of Asia and Africa, to make good. We are determined not to be dominated in any way by any other country or continent. We are determined to bring happiness and prosperity to our people and to discard the age-old shackles that have tied us not only politically but economically—the shackles of colonialism and other shackles of our own making. Asia is no longer passive—it has been passive enough in the past. It is no longer a submissive Asia—it has tolerated submissiveness too long. The Asia of today is dynamic—it is full of life. Where there is life there is advance.

Nehru vehemently opposed the plans of imperialism of involving Asian countries in military pacts which were the extensions of NATO, of cold war politics fanned by the US as part of its world wide strategy to oppose developing nations. He raised his powerful voice against SEATO.

Speaking in the Lok Sabha on September 29, 1954, he said

"Hon Members may remember the old days when the great powers had spheres of influence in Asia and elsewhere. The countries of Asia were then too weak to do anything about it. The quarrel was between the Big Powers and they sometimes came to an agreement about dividing the countries in spheres of influence. It seems to me that this particular Manila Treaty is inclined dangerously in the direction of spheres of influence to be exercised by powerful countries. After all, it is the big and powerful countries that will decide matters and not the two or three weak and small Asian nations that may be allied to them.

"Another fact in which I should like to draw Members' attention is the reference in this Treaty to aggression. One can understand mention of external aggression in a defence treaty, but there is reference also to 'a fact or situation created within this area' which might entitle them to intervene. Observe these words. They do not refer to external invasion.

Any internal development in that area might also entitle these countries to intervene. Does this not effect the whole conception of integrity, sovereignty and independence of the countries of the area? We in India have ventured to talk about an area of peace. The Manila Treaty rather comes in the way of that area of peace. It takes up that very area which might be an area of peace and converts it almost into an area of potential war. I find this development disturbing."

Nehru could not countenance the idea of Western powers staging a re-entry in liberated Asia.

'We have thought in terms of freeing our countries, and one of the symbols of freedom has been the withdrawal of foreign armed forces. I say the return of any armed forces from any European or any American country is a reversal of the history of the countries of Asia, whatever the motive. It was suggested some two or three years ago in connection with Kashmir that some European or American countries should send forces to Kashmir. We rejected that completely because, so far as we can see, on no account are we going to allow any foreign forces to land in India. This is our outlook, and it is something more than a mere Indian outlook. It is an outlook which applies to the whole of or a large part of this continent of Asia. Therefore, we regret this military aid coming from the USA to Pakistan."

Nehru did not voice his opposition to war plans only in Asia but he did so in other regions of the world too. His passion for peace was embedded in India's glorious past, in the traditions laid down by Buddha, Ashoka and Mahatma Gandhi. It was rooted in the firm and unshakable belief that no nation more so a developing one, could advance in an atmosphere of war or war like preparations. Nehru's dedication to the cause of peace was total. Peace became the watchword of our country's foreign policy. As he put it himself so well in his speech in the Constituent Assembly on March 18, 1948

"The supreme question that one has to face today in the world is how we can avoid a world war. Some people seem to think that it is unavoidable and, therefore, they prepare for it and prepare for it not only in a military sense, but in a psychological sense and thereby bring the war nearer¹ to think in terms of inevitability of world war is a dangerous thinking. I should like this House and the country to appreciate what a world war means, what it is to bring to men it will mean such utter catastrophe that for a generation or more everything we stand for in the way of progress and ad

vancement of humanity will be put to an end. This is a terrible thing to contemplate. I feel India can play a big part, and perhaps an effective part, in helping to avoid war.

The idea of a world war was repugnant to India and its people. It was something their ethos could not even conceive of. More so, when in the modern world the war was going to be fought with the deadliest of weapons before which the nuclear bombs, first tried in an Asian country, looked like fire balls. Speaking in the House of People (Lok Sabha) on April 2, 1954, Jawaharlal Nehru said

"We know little more about the hydrogen bomb and its disastrous and horrible consequences than what has appeared in the press or is otherwise a matter of general knowledge or speculation. But even what we know, and the very fact that the full facts of the effects of these explosives do not appear to be known or to be ascertainable with any certainty even by scientists, point to certain conclusions. A new weapon of unprecedented power, both in volume and intensity, with an unascertained and unascertainable range of destructive potential in respect of time and space is being tested unleashing its massive power, for use as a weapon of war. We know that its use threatens the existence of man's civilisation."

Peace thus came to be the sheet anchor of India's foreign policy, its ultimate objective to the realisation of which Nehru devoted all the years of his Prime Ministership. This objective was embodied in his famous five principles popularly known as Panchsheel. These were

- (1) Respect for each other's territory, integrity and sovereignty
- (2) Non aggression
- (3) Non interference in each other's internal affairs.
- (4) Equality and mutual benefit
- (5) Peaceful co-existence

Ever since these ideas of peaceful co-existence were initially evolved and promulgated, as Nehru stated in the Lok

Sabha on September 17, 1955, "not only have they spread in the world and influenced more and more countries, but they have progressively acquired a greater depth and meaning .

Panchsheel has acquired a specific meaning and significance in world affairs "

About the most important ingredient of India's foreign policy, the instrument, as it were, for giving shape and form to it, was Nehru's policy of non-alignment. He was its architect, and he nurtured it with care and tenderness, with persistence and patience. In his usual humility, he said

"I have not originated the policy of non-alignment. It is a policy inherent in the circumstances of India inherent in the past thinking of India, inherent in the whole mental outlook of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom, and inherent in the circumstances of the world today. I come in by the mere accidental fact that during the few years I have represented that policy as Foreign Minister" (Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, p. 80)

World statesmen have said it on more than one occasion, and authors like Michael Brecher and Vincent Sheen have all agreed that Nehru was the fulcrum round which the policy of non alignment revolved. He was its "soul" as well as "mind". Nothing pained him so much as the vituperative language used to misrepresent it, wrench it out of context, and paint it in a manner abhorrent to the architect himself. He defended non alignment against the charge that it was "passive neutrality", that it was an euphemism for "inaction" when world issues came to the fore. Speaking in the Parliament on March 17, 1956 he put the policy in its right perspective:

"We wanted to follow not a merely neutral or negative policy but a positive one naturally helping those forces that we consider right and naturally disapproving the things that we do not like and keeping away from other countries

Basis of India's Foreign Policy

and alignments of powers which normally led to conflicts”

Speaking in the Council of States on February 16, 1956, he declared.

“To become part of a power bloc means giving up the right to have a policy of our own and following that of somebody else. Surely, this is not the kind of future any self respecting person would like to envisage for our great country”

Nehru's non alignment emerged unscathed from the attacks to which it was subjected to by its pathological enemies like Dulles and by those cold war warriors who were disappointed in having failed in dragging India into bloc entanglements. Non alignment also came out unscathed from the unwarranted invasion from our neighbour, China. Speaking a few months after Chinese attack on India's borders, he stated in the Lok Sabha on September 3, 1963

“I would repeat that in our external policy we attach great importance to what has been called non alignment with any particular bloc. That does not mean that we have weakened in our desire to adhere to non alignment fully. Non alignment is a part of the broader policy of working for world peace and cooperation. We have arrived at a stage when any other policy may lead to world disaster. For our part, we adhere to non alignment”

Nehru's policy of non alignment has been steadfastly pursued by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. She has not deviated from it an inch much as her enemies may try to affirm even in the face of facts clear as crystal. While her father was the architect of non alignment and steered its boat in international weathers, with cold war waves lashing at with fury against it, Mrs. Gandhi brought it ashore safe as is seen in the strength it has gathered today. She has made non alignment more dynamic and more purposeful during her stewardship of the nation. During the tenure of her office she

economic aspects of non alignment have received greater attention. The views expressed at the Lima Foreign Ministers' Conference in August 1975 have become the groundwork for the evolution of a new international economic order. "On our part," she said in her welcome address at a meeting with President Tito and President Nasser, "the non aligned countries must make a tremendous effort to become self reliant in order to give fuller meaning and content to our independence. Only by mutual cooperation in the economic, political and cultural spheres can this objective be furthered." An outstanding result of this tripartite meeting, held in New Delhi in October 1966, was the collective approach to the economic challenges to non alignment and to peaceful coexistence. This collective approach had, of course, emerged earlier, but its systematic extension as non aligned solidarity in the form of continuous consultations, meetings and conferences at all levels to meet with manifold world problems was significant evolution in the operational methods of non alignment.

Under the bold and perspicacious leadership of Mrs Gandhi, India continues to pursue the policy of non alignment, even in the changed internal and international circumstances with what External Affairs Minister, Mr Y B Chavan calls 'originality in continuity'. The vast changes that have overtaken the world have only confirmed the continuing validity of non alignment. Under the impact of these changes military blocs and alignments have been thrown into disarray, while non alignment has come to embrace more and more countries. The paramount relevance of non-alignment lies in the fact that as Nehru put it once, it is "tuned to the development of the future". Therein lies its inherent vitality, its inherent viability and its inherent power to attract those who still lie outside its orbit.

India's foreign policy has had to contend with the politics of alignment of its immediate neighbour Pakistan which took the fatal step of entering into military partnership with

the USA and of becoming a part of its bloc politics" According to Nixon's biographer, Ralph de Toledano, the then Vice President, on his return from a tour of Asian countries, urged US military aid to Pakistan 'as a counterforce to the confirmed neutralism of Jawaharlal Nehru' (Nixon, London, 1957, p 164) The infamous "tilt" in Nixon-Kissinger's policies towards Pakistan explains, to a large extent, the tragedy that overtook the sub continent in 1971 when Gen Yahya Khan's ruthless military government butchered tens of thousands of people of what was then East Pakistan, leading to the outbreak of war and finally to the emergence of Bangladesh

The interference of outside powers vitiated Indo Pakistan relations and prevented the two sister countries from successfully establishing good neighbourly relations Mrs Gandhi made steadfast efforts for amity between the two countries It was largely at her initiative and through her perseverance that the historic Simla agreement was arrived at The agreement was a major turning point India under Mrs Gandhi is determined to do everything possible to promote the process started by the Simla agreement We should not, however, forget that the outside powers have done their might and main to reverse the process of normalisation and to further aggravate tensions in the sub continent

Our Prime Minister's recent initiative in normalising relations between India and Pakistan bore fruit when at Islamabad the Foreign Secretaries of the two countries evolved an agreement to re-establish full diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level, to restore other severed links like the air links, including over flights, and road and rail links The agreement has been hailed as a major breakthrough in Indo-Pakistan relations, promising to improve them and to lead to their normalisation It is fully in accord with the Simla agreement

It is unfortunate that certain reactionary elements in Pakistan had been stepping up a campaign of vilification

against India, against the very path of non alignment it is pursuing. Once the *Pakistan Times* tried to make out that there was no truly non aligned country in the world! Yugoslavia was singled out as exploiting non alignment to provide itself with a stature in the international community far bigger than what its population, economic potential or geographical position entitled it! Derogatory references were made to Marshal Tito who was described as the only "surviving self styled apostle" of non alignment. India was criticised of course on the expected lines as being an "expansionist" power bent upon extending its hegemony all over Asia. A very insidious attempt was made even to create misunderstanding with Nepal and Sri Lanka.

As against non alignment Muslim nations who constitute a majority of members of the non aligned group are being urged by Pakistan's theocratic and reactionary circles to consolidate in Islamic grouping. Many tears are being shed over the fact that not much work has been done in the nature of a follow up of the second Islamic summit. In fact it was said that while Pakistan had always supported the Arab cause even to the point of annoying its "known friends" and at considerable risk to its own economic and other interests some of the Arab countries have been rather apathetic to Pakistan's problems such as "the right of self determination of the people of Kashmir".

The major objective in launching a tirade against non alignment is to project the concept of an Islamic bloc as opposed to the non aligned group. The fact that many Muslim countries have made it categorically clear that the two concepts are not contradictory and may actually be complementary to each other is irksome to Pakistan's ruling circles. As is well known the stand of most Muslim countries is that Islamic conferences are important for discussing various religious and socio-economic problems of the Muslims of the world. But the major political threat to Muslim nations emanates

from the imperialist Zionist gang up against the Third World. Thus, there should not be any conflict between non alignment which is essentially a political idea and Islamic fraternity based upon common religious and spiritual bonds.

Consistent with our basic policy and our national interests, the Government of India has striven to maintain friendly relations with the USA on the basis of equality, reciprocity, mutual respect and non interference. Indo-US relations suffered when Washington took a hostile attitude towards some of our basic national issues. Building of Diego Garcia as a nuclear military base, goes counter to the national interests of our country and poses a danger to peace and security in Asia. A fruitful dialogue with the USA is possible only if it recognises the rightful position India has come to occupy in the region, if it abandons its policy of "tilt" towards Pakistan and gives up the plan to convert Indian sub-continent into a hot bed of imperialist intrigues. Our country has friendly and co-operative relations with the USSR. The signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Peace and Co-operation with the USSR was a great landmark in the evolution of India's foreign policy. It reinforced the traditional friendship between the two countries and enabled cooperation on a higher and more extensive level in the work for peace and development. Some interested international quarters, always looking for an opportunity to hit at India's policies, criticised this historic treaty as not in keeping with the policy of non alignment. Mr Chavan repelled this propaganda when he said that the treaty strengthened both the concept and the conduct of non alignment as it specifically and solemnly embodies Soviet recognition and respect for India's policy of non alignment.

Mr Y B Chavan declared in the Lok Sabha on April 8, 1976 that India's relations with the USSR and the USA could not be bracketed together as there was a qualitative difference in the ties with the two countries. India's relations with the USSR, which had stood by us through all our

ordeals and with which our outlook on different international issues was similar, were excellent and warm. As for the USA, its stand on some issues was just the opposite of that of India. There were occasions when India and the US came into conflict when the latter's interests extended to global policy. Mr Chavan said L I Brezhnev's reference to India at the 25th Congress of the CPSU was ample proof of the very good, excellent and warm relationship between the two countries. The USSR had stood by us in all our difficult times and helped enormously in the economic and industrial policy of this country, he added.

The President of the Indian National Congress, Shri D K Barooah also underlined, in clear and forceful words, difference in attitude of the USSR and the USA towards our country which our foreign policy planners take into consideration while evolving postures on issues which face Asia and the world at large. Addressing the seminar on New Perspectives of Indo Soviet Cooperation held in March 1975, Shri D K Barooah said

'So far as the role of the Soviet Union is concerned, as I have said, it has been a vital factor in the strengthening of our economy, in the strengthening of our security, and, even more than that, in creating a climate of peace and security in the region to which we belong. I would like you to consider the different roles of the two leading countries of the world—the USA and the USSR—in this region. We have to consider how far they have been helpful or otherwise to the cause of peace and security in Asia. My views on this question are very clear and categorical. I believe that the American gun running in this region has increased insecurity in the region. In the Middle East, in South East Asia, in South Asia, in all these areas, the sordid game of gun running the traditional game of the imperialists has been going on merrily."

In a message published in the book 'India and the Soviet

Union, Prime Minister of India Mrs Indira Gandhi summed up the role which Indo-Soviet relations have played on the international plans and bilaterally. She declared

"Friendship between India and the Soviet Union pre-dates our Independence. It is rooted in the realisation on our part of the historic significance of the Soviet experiment in man's quest for equality and justice and the Soviet people's recognition of independent India's role in the international community. Our two countries have worked together on the international scene to support the liberation struggles of colonial peoples and to oppose all forms of racialism.

Indo-Soviet friendship has led to greater cultural interchange and has taken the concrete form of mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation. We in India deeply appreciate the help given by the Soviet Union to our effort of establishing basic industries in the State sector by which we have been able to strengthen the foundations of our economic self reliance and industrial progress.

In India we are still in the midst of transition from an unequal feudal society into a modern egalitarian society. We have adopted the path of planning for we know that the problems of poverty and disparity can be solved only when the nation as a whole through the organs of State power, carries out its social responsibility. We know also that newly free countries can ensure their long term security only through the achievement of internal economic strength and political cohesion.

While engaged in strengthening its own nationhood independent India has consistently rejected narrow national chauvinism and has sought friendship and cooperation with all nations. We have consistently upheld coexistence for confrontation is the enemy of peace without which poorer countries cannot progress or even survive. The close and expanding friendship between the Soviet Union and India is an example of how peoples with different backgrounds can work

together to strengthen bilateral relations and serve the larger cause of international peace and understanding "

India, following the path laid down by Nehru, has developed friendly and cooperative relations with its neighbours, Bangladesh, Nepal, Burma, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, the countries of Indo-China, Afghanistan, Iran and the Arab countries. Those countries are our geographical and cultural neighbours.

India is also in the forefront of countries developing close political and economic relations with Latin America and the Caribbean.

India's policy of non alignment is not an idealistic and romantic international posture though it is actuated by the ideas of peace, freedom, equality and cooperation. This is a policy calculated to safeguard the country's national interests. The first prerequisite in the pursuit of non alignment is, therefore, the development of internal economic, social and political stability and strength. From the beginning India has given primary importance to planning for socio-economic development. The Prime Minister's 20-Point Programme has accelerated this process of development towards greater prosperity and social justice. A prosperous India is a guarantee of peace in Asia, a guarantee of the success of the movement of non alignment which Nehru pioneered and which his daughter is successfully carrying forward in the altered world situation today.

CHAPTER II

A New Asian Era at Bandung

The Afro Asian community forms the core of the non-aligned group. These nations constitute its mainstay, its main driving force. Their unity and solidarity are the guarantee that non alignment will endure the pressures of its opponents.

The concept of "oneness of Asia", of "Asian personality" which, with the emergence of liberated Africa, broadened into the concept of Afro Asian solidarity—had been indivisible from the longings of colonial peoples to free themselves from Western colonial bondage. Sun Yat sen, in his 1924 declaration, declared that the liberation struggle in Asia could only succeed if 'all Asiatic peoples unite and stand as one.' Mahatma Gandhi wrote in 1920 about the growing solidarity of Asian countries in their struggle against Western colonialism. C R Das who presided over the 1922 annual session of the Indian National Congress, urged India's participation in an Asian federation which he regarded as inevitable. The talk about an Asian federation again figured at the Congress sessions in 1926 and 1928. In 1940, Jawaharlal Nehru advanced the idea of forming an Asian federation as a constituent of the world federation of future (Jawaharlal Nehru, *An Autobiography*).

The idea of Asian federation was not entirely a product of an idealist strain in Indian nationalism. It also expressed,

forcefully and graphically, the growing awareness of an Asian identity in the course of the continent's struggle against Western colonial domination. Among the many factors listed by Nehru which make the Asian countries unite together, apart from geography, were as follows. First, experience of colonial domination by Europe, Second, the process of "finding oneself" after their coming together; Third, the fear that freedom may be lost to Europe once again, Fourth, common economic needs (India's Foreign Policy: Selected Speeches of Jawaharlal Nehru, 1946-61, p. 261)

Since India was the first among Asian countries to cast off its colonial bondage, it took the lead in giving a call for forging the unity of the peoples of the continent, for developing solidarity with Africa, to help newly independent countries to evolve their foreign policies within the framework of non-alignment for building zones of peace, and for establishing friendship with progressive, anti-imperialist forces of the world of which the socialist camp formed an integral and important part.

Following the military defeat of Nazism and militarist Japan to which the USSR made a signal contribution, the socialist system emerged on a wide scale, the colonial system, reared and ruthlessly maintained by imperialist powers, started disintegrating. Young independent states began emerging from the ruins of colonial empires, transforming the "social landscape" of the globe. While India was approaching its full and final release from British colonial domination, Jawaharlal Nehru thought it fit and timely to convene in New Delhi the first Asian Relations Conference. The very holding of the conference reaffirmed that Asia, long held in colonial servitude, had arrived on the scene and could no longer be browbeaten and held back from advance. "For too long we of Asia have been petitioners in Western courts and chancelleries," Nehru underscored the point in a powerful language. "That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on

our own feet and to cooperate with all others who are prepared to co operate with We do not intend to be the play things of others (Report of Proceedings and Documentation of First Asian Relations Conference, p 24)

Naturally, the entire West frothed with rage at the very idea of holding this conference The changing structure of politics in Asia was not to the liking of imperialists from whose hands the colonies were slipping out one after another, in one continent and the other in Asia and Africa Understandably the *New York Times* (March 26 1947) warned the Western world to watch carefully what was happening in the Indian capital since it may have large potentialities " In a similar vein the *London Times* wrote 'The world has a new force to reckon with in the awakened spirit of Asia'

The imperialists therefore did their best to see that a larger number of countries did not attend the conference G H Jansen wrote in his book *Afro-Asia and Non alignment*

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that British diplomatic representatives in some areas of Asia at least did their best to render the invitations abortive (p 46)

The invitations were sent through British diplomatic missions as India then had no independent relations with Afro-Asian countries Not one single British mission forwarded the applications to Arab countries The French colonial authorities on their part did their utmost to prevent the invitation reaching Ho Chi Minh

The imperialists especially strove—as India had no diplomatic relations with the USSR then—to make sure that invitations did not reach the Soviet Central Asian Republics (Ibid, p 46) But the invitations were sent by Mr Krishna Menon through Soviet Foreign Minister who 'warmly welcomed the idea of the conference (Ibid, p 47)

Imperialists were sore on the idea of Soviet Central Asian Republics attending the conference The Western

powers also felt infuriated when Nehru, greeting the Soviet representatives, spoke with special warmth about the Soviet Republics of Asia which, he declared, "have advanced so rapidly in our generation"

The first Asian Relations Conference, a prelude to the Bandung Conference, was thus an event of historic significance. For the first time in history the countries of Asia came together on one platform, speaking a common language of anti imperialism along with the Soviet Central Asian Republics which, with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, had torn themselves away from imperialism and started a new socialist way of life. The conference stressed the need for Asian unity. It epitomised what Nehru called "a widespread urge and an awareness that the time had come for us the people of Asia, to meet together, to hold together and to advance together" (*Report of Proceedings and Declarations of First Asian Relations Conference*, p. 24)

Mahatma Gandhi also addressed the conference. He expressed his ideas how economic and cultural ties among the countries of the continent could be strengthened. The great leader of the Indian freedom movement, who had shaken imperialism to its very roots and had inspired the freedom movements in Asia and Africa, was given a thunderous applause.

The Prime Minister of the Provisional Government of Indonesia, Dr. Sultan Shahriar, pleaded for preservation of "Asian sentiment" as "a holy flame" (*Ibid.*, p. 241). He exhorted the Asian peoples to pull all their "energies into the task of making this conference serve the beginning of mutual endeavour on the part of all Asians for a better world in which the granting of political, social and economic justice to all will lead to 'One Asia'."

The conference, attended by 32 countries, held on a non governmental level, discussed problems connected with the Asian peoples' struggles against colonialism and racialism.

and for coordinating their foreign policies. It put forward the idea of unity of Asian peoples' struggle against colonial rule, the community of their aims, and the need for Asian co-operation. The conference also discussed such question as the national liberation movements in Asia, intra Asia migration, cultural cooperation, conversion of economies from colonial to national lines, demand for freedom of colonial peoples. It outlined the contours of the future political and economic cooperation of Asian peoples. It was at this conference that, for the first time, the question of expediency of drawing up a programme for ensuring the independence and security of Asian countries through their collective efforts was mooted. The importance of this meeting of Asian countries lay in the fact that this first all Asian forum signified the emergence of independent Asia in the international arena capable of influencing the course of world events. Nehru emphasised that "this occasion is unique in history", being "a landmark which divides the past of Asia from the future". The conference heralded Asia's historic resurgence.

India again took the lead in organising another conference of Asian countries in New Delhi in 1949. The need for taking the initiative had arisen as the Indian Government, coming out in support of the liberation movements and against colonial oppression, could not sit idle while the Dutch imperialists were committing aggressive acts against the young republic of Indonesia. Nineteen countries officially took part in the conference. The Dutch had been encouraged in their aggressive acts with the connivance of Western powers—the USA and Britain—who lent them moral and material assistance. The Dutch action came as a sharp reminder to Asian opinion of the grim after-effects of a colonial power's partnership with Western military blocs which had already taken place to oppose new developing nations. Nehru described the Dutch actions in Indonesia as "the most naked and unabashed aggression" (G. H. Jansen, *Afro-Asia and Non-Alignment*, p. 85).

This conference the first meeting of Asian nations held at governmental level caused anxiety among Western countries. Indeed the Western governments were even more dubious and fearful of this conference than they had been of its predecessor for this after all was an official gathering" (Ibid, p 87) But why this apprehension? In the words of G H Jansen "An official publicity directive issued by the Indian Government on 17th January had this to say 'The United Kingdom and United States attitude—the initial nervousness was the result of apprehension that after this first meeting the Asian countries might learn to work together in matters of common interest and thus break away from the tutelage of Western powers'" (Ibid.) The West, therefore, took measures to see that the conference was not held at all. The New York Times (22nd January, 1949) declared pontifically that foreign diplomats in New Delhi had impressed on Nehru the view that an anti Western bloc would be disadvantageous and would create a cleavage in the UN

The conference was after all an Asian riposte to a flagrant attack made by an European colonial power on an East Asian government that it had itself recognised in breach of two solemn international pledges and orders of the UN. After centuries of political domination and racial exclusiveness practised by Western Europe in Asia Europe was now afraid and indignant at the possibility that Asia might come into its own. Western Europe had regrouped itself into NATO. When Asia came closer together to fight back its tentacles spreading over the continent the imperialists howled back saying "This is a wicked animal. It defends itself when attacked."

Despite imperialist efforts to thwart its proceedings the second New Delhi conference again discussed—this time on a governmental level—forms of Asian unity needed to fight colonialism. Nehru proposed setting up of a committee consisting of representatives of Asian countries in the UN for hold

ing discussion on major issues pertaining to the continent. The Ceylonese delegation put forward the idea of regional defence of Asian countries. The outcome of this conference was seen in the fact that the Dutch colonialists were forced to withdraw from Indonesia and that country was declared independent on 1 January 1950—the date specified in the conference decision.

The next Asian meet was held in 1954 in Colombo which demanded that an immediate stop be put to imperialist intervention in Indo-China. The conference also considered the proposal for a conference of independent Asian and African countries for working out a coordinated policy on the most crucial aspects of international relations. The conference was attended by the Prime Ministers of India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon and Pakistan. This was a decisive development indeed for the Colombo Conference directly stemmed the Bandung Conference with all its immense consequences. (G. H. Jansen, *Afro Asia and Non Alignment*, p. 143)

It was at this conference that Nehru came out against the bogey of "anti communism" raised by the US as a counterfoil to the demand for anti colonialism. It was a mere echo of the "American thesis" he explained (*Ibid.*, p. 160). Nehru also made it clear that in Asia opposition should be expressed both to classical colonialism in North Africa and to white settler governments in Central and East Africa—an anticipation of neo-colonialism.

The Five Prime Ministers next met at Bogor in the same year (December 28 and 29) to make arrangements for holding the first Afro Asian Conference at Bandung to draw up its agenda and a list of its participants. The People's Republic of China was invited at the insistence of India. Nehru took the lead in formulating the tasks for the Bandung Conference. In a note he sent to other Prime Ministers before the Bogor meeting he suggested that the whole object should

be to create an atmosphere of cooperation and to put Asia and Africa more in the world picture since 'the old balances no longer hold good' " (Ibid., p 172) "A vision of a grand assemblage of the two continents rather than of an amplified Afro-Asian group was carried by Mr Nehru to Bogor" (Ibid , p 172)

The Bandung Conference was the first official conference of Asian and African countries destined to have a great impact on world events. The imperialist West, naturally, sounded the alarm. Walter Lippman wrote in the *New York Times* that no illusions should be cherished that the USA and its allies in Western Europe would be judges and not defendants at the forthcoming conference. The best comment on Western reaction came from Gen. Romulo of Philippines. He said "That the West was generally apprehensive about Bandung betrays an uneasy conscience, a sense of guilt" (*The Meaning of Bandung*, University of North Carolina Press 1956)

"While messages of goodwill came to the conference from President Voroshilov of USSR and the Presidiums of five Soviet Central Asian Republics," wrote G.H. Jansen "the United States Government had not yet emerged from its sulks. As Congressman Powell put it, President Eisenhower had 'stupidly' rejected his suggestion to send greetings. he had a telegram from the State Department to prove it, which stated that the Department doubted whether the relationship of the United States to the conference 'would warrant a message'" (Op cit, pp 192-193)

The Bandung Conference was warmly welcomed by the USSR and by other socialist countries. The Soviet Foreign Ministry in a statement (April 16 1955) expressed its firm belief that the Bandung Conference would enhance the national self-consciousness of African and Asian peoples and promote cooperation among them. help lessen international tension and safeguard world peace. "The ideas of Bandung"

as L I Brezhnev said later, "are aimed at ensuring the security of Afro-Asian countries, at their unity and solidarity in the struggle against the policy of imperialist blocs, of colonialism, neo-colonialism and all forms of racial and colonial oppression "

The Bandung conference which opened on April 18, 1955, was attended by 29 Afro-Asian sovereign states. Bandung was until then a little known Indonesian town. To it came 340 delegates from countries with territories totalling 30 million kilometres (about a quarter of the world's land surface) and with a population of nearly 1,500 million (about two-thirds of world population). Attending the conference as observers were Archbishop Makarios who represented Cyprus which was then fighting for its independence and former Mufti of Jerusalem Amin Al Hussein who represented the long suffering Arab people of Palestine. The very fact that the conference was so representative was sufficient proof that the Western powers had failed in their endeavour of preventing it from taking place. All this turned the conference into a factor of major international importance.

The conference set up three committees: political, economic and cultural. The agenda, already approved at Bogor, consisted mainly of the following items: economic cooperation, cultural cooperation, human rights and right of self-determination, problem of dependent peoples, and world peace and cooperation.

The Political Committee discussed issues of the greatest concern to the Third World countries. Prime Minister Nehru unmasked the real nature of efforts made to befuddle the minds of Third World people in order to prevent a full disclosure of the real countenance of colonialism and neo-colonialism of Western imperialist powers. G H Jansen revealed in his book that by late March a secret committee set up in the US State Department had been able to produce the following remarkably accurate forecast of Bandung. China would

be moderate, in order to raise her prestige and show herself diplomatically acceptable, the Chinese Premier would be cautious and reasonable and there would be a struggle for leadership between him and Nehru who was expected to give the meet a lead (*Ibid* , pp 185-186)

Nehru's speech, supported by other heads of governments at the conference, and his vigorous spate of activities at the camps of Afro Asian delegations, helped expose colonialism and neo-colonialism and thus upheld the role which history had assigned to this first ever conference of its kind. The East European states, he said, could not be described as colonies for they were sovereign national states, recognised not only by Afro-Asian nations, but also by Western powers and, some of them, by the UN as well of which they were members

Nehru, thus gave the lead in fighting back Western imperialism's bid to detach the Third World from the socialist world, to sow strife and discord between them, and to continue the edifice of the old international order. This mantle of the West has now, unfortunately, fallen on China which is doing everything to undo the spirit of Bandung. It was again not China but India and Egypt, where the revolution led by Nasser had triumphed, which took the lead in calling for liberation of dependent peoples and for ending the colonial rule. China's main objective appeared to build up a bloc of Afro-Asian countries under its leadership and not to help to evolve a united line to counter pro Western strategy aimed at disrupting the conference. This fitted in admirably with its great power hegemonistic role which it was to reveal later in its most brutal and naked form. Paradoxically, it was in the Bandung year of 1955, as G H Jansen explains that the Chinese attempts at nibbles and probes in relation to India continued, which had been preceded by Peking's claim on Indian territory, according to this well informed author, 48 days after the signing of the Sino-Indian

agreement on Tibet establishing the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. The planning of the construction of the road linking Western Tibet with Sinkiang, running across Indian territory in northern Ladakh, must have begun long before Bandung (Ibid, p 323). This speaks of China's "genuine" interest in building the united front of the Third World.

For Nehru and for other leaders of Afro-Asian nations, Bandung meant the opposite of what China was preparing for through deception and deceit. Nehru went to the conference as the envoy of resurgent Asia, proclaiming its indomitable spirit of unity and invincibility, its indestructible solidarity with Africa for the common task of eradicating the common enemy—colonialism—for preventing its re-entry directly or indirectly, for disentangling the two continents from the web of Western pacts, and for building a new world order based on peace, justice and equality. Above all, he went to Bandung with desire to assert Panchsheel as a general principle of international conduct, as the only possible basis of world peace. He told the Indian Parliament that Panchsheel was a challenge to the people of Asia to the rest of the world and each country would have to give a direct answer. He hoped each country would be asked to say whether it stood for non aggression and non interference or not.

It would not be wrong to say that the most important document to emerge from Bandung was the unanimously adopted Declaration on Promotion of Universal Peace and Co-operation. It proclaimed the following principles rightly called the Distillation of the Bandung Spirit.

- (1) Observance of basic human rights and the UN Charter
- (2) Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries
- (3) Recognition of the equality of all races and nations, big and small

- (4) Renunciation of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other countries
- (5) Respect for the right of each country to individual and collective defence in conformity with the UN Charter
- (6) Renunciation of use of this right in the interests of any great power and to refrain from pressuring other countries
- (7) Abstention from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity and independence of any country
- (8) Settlement of all international disputes peacefully in conformity with the UN Charter
- (9) Promotion of mutual interests and cooperation
- (10) Respect for justice and international commitments

These ten principles of Bandung are the principles forming the four corners within which the foreign policies of the non-aligned nations are formulated by themselves

The Bandung Conference not only formulated and endorsed the principles of relations among Asian and African states but also announced that these principles should form the basis of the entire gamut of international relations. The Bandung decisions promoted the cause of liquidating colonialism which has vitiated the international order and which has also injected inequality in relations among Western states and developing countries. The participants in the conference expressed support for general disarmament, prohibition of production stockpiling, testing and use of nuclear weapons, dismantling of military bases on the territories of other lands, scrapping military blocs set up by imperialist states.

The Bandung Conference was an event of great significance also because it revealed the victory of the trend in

Afro-Asian countries towards strengthening their independence and promoting a policy of non alignment. Non alignment was not understood in the classical 19th century European concept of non involvement but as a dynamic policy directed against imperialism and for national advance. Jawaharlal Nehru said after the conclusion of the conference

"The common factor was rather against Western domination. Everybody agreed about that. The other common factor was a desire for social progress. Again everybody agreed about that." (T. Mende, *Conversations with Nehru*, London, 1956)

Speaking in the Indian Parliament six days after the conference, Nehru said

Bandung proclaimed the political emergence in world affairs of over half the world's population. It would be a misreading of history to regard Bandung as though it was an isolated occurrence and not part of a great movement of human history" (Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, pp 279-280)

Commentators, even of the Western school, agreed that non alignment became the sole basis of 'Afro Asianism' as subsequent events showed. Bandung proved to be a powerful catalyst in speeding up the establishment and development of active non alignment, resting on anti imperialism, which went to form the basis of the foreign policies of Afro-Asian countries. The standard bearer of this developing trend in international relations was Nehru.

The progressive and patriotic ideas of non alignment rooted in an uncompromising struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism objectively strengthen the alliance of the Third World countries with other Socialist countries.

The Bandung Conference has preserved its significance even today. Its call for the unity of Asian and African peoples in their struggle against imperialism, for national indepen-

dence, lasting peace and international cooperation and the principles it proclaimed for growing international relations continue exercising an enormous influence on the developments of world events, especially on the destiny of the people of the two continents

The Bandung Conference met at a time when international relations were still dominated by the spirit of cold war started by the West. Since the conference was held, the world has undergone a vast change in the political, economic and social fields to the detriment of imperialism and reaction and in favour of the forces of national liberation, social progress and world peace. The colonial system of imperialism has finally disintegrated and the Western world is going through a still deeper crisis. The assertion of the principles of Bandung in international relations has been facilitated in a large measure by the fact that the economic and defence potential of socialist countries and newly independent states has grown immeasurably and a favourable international climate of détente has been created as a result of the role played by the peace forces and the non aligned countries in the world.

Nevertheless, imperialism continues to be aggressive even though its worldwide strength does not remain as it used to be when non alignment had just emerged as a trend on the world scene. During the last 25 years or so, about 50 armed conflicts instigated by imperialists and their allies took place in Asia alone. This called for keeping the Bandung spirit alive, for deepening its anti imperialist content and for strengthening still further the international alliances between the forces of national liberation and the non aligned countries. Naturally, the non aligned nations continue taking the Bandung Declaration as the criteria for their foreign policies. What these countries have done so far has been permeated with the Bandung spirit. What is more important is that more nations are adhering to this spirit. There can be no denying the fact that the Bandung Spirit has relevance till the

last outpost of imperialism, colonialism and racialism is stamped out of the world. Let it not be forgotten that this spirit is finding its echo today in Latin America also where non alignment is attracting ever more supporters. Bandung has, thus, marked an important stage in the growth of the non aligned movement which now embraces more than 80 countries of the world.

CHAPTER III

The Renegade of Bandung Spirit

Today, 21 years after the Bandung Conference, its decisions acquire a new meaning in the context of the Asian countries' striving for evolving a system of collective security in the continent. As observed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, most of the armed conflicts, if not all, in the beginning arose from the reluctance of imperialism to renounce its supremacy and, later, from having recourse to new forms of intervention. The wars in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and the Middle East and the armed conflicts elsewhere in Asia and Africa prove that imperialism and reaction do not want to reckon with the principles proclaimed from the Afro-Asian platform at Bandung. The growing strength of the non-aligned countries, their increasing role in world affairs guarantee that the spirit of Bandung and the concept of solidarity and co-operation embodying the ten principles of the Bandung will contribute greatly to the defeat of the game of imperialism, to the evolution of Afro-Asian world—so long a captive of the West—into a gigantic zone of peace, cooperation and friendship with their security collectively guaranteed by them without any external "protective umbrella".

The question comes to mind why was not the Second Bandung, as provided in the historic recommendations of the first conference, held in Algiers in 1965? An answer to this

question will alert the reader to beware of another danger to the unity of the Third World. The danger is as real today as it was over ten years back when the second Bandung was torpedoed.

While making preparations for the second Afro-Asian summit, progressive forces in the countries of Asia and Africa looked upon it as a new important step along the road of strengthening the unity of their peoples in the struggle against imperialism, for national independence, lasting peace and international cooperation, as an opportunity for further developing and asserting in the practice of international relations the principles and ideas of Bandung in the conditions of disintegration of imperialism's colonial system.

During that period the Chinese leadership, eager to win the sympathies of the people of Afro-Asian countries and to carry out its great power plans, demonstrated, for tactical purposes, its acceptance of Afro-Asian approach.

The real intentions of the Chinese leaders, however, differed from their much publicised statements.

First, they wanted at that time to use the second Bandung to assert Peking's hegemony over the national liberation movements and other developing countries and to use this influence to exert pressure on the United States to recognise China as a "worthy partner".

Secondly, acting in accordance with its policy of breaking away from the rest of the socialist community, Peking wanted to isolate Afro-Asian countries from the socialist community.

During their unofficial contacts with Afro-Asian leaders, the Chinese leaders struck a somewhat different posture on the question of Soviet participation in the conference. They combined unbridled slander against the USSR with attempts to pressurise the Afro-Asian leaders into consenting to a compromise suiting the Chinese.

The Chinese leadership also tried in every way to discredit and isolate India, looking at its prestige as a serious obstacle to the assertion of Peking's hegemony in the Afro-Asian world. Chinese propaganda hammered away on the theme that "the Indian Government wants to sabotage the Afro-Asian conference" (*Jenmin Jihpao*, June 17, 1965). When the Indo-Pakistan conflict flared up in summer 1965, China made every possible use to unleash anti Indian propaganda. Peking accused India of "violating the ceasefire line and provoking and expanding the conflict". At the same time, India was also accused of "using the territory of Sikkim for aggressive actions against China". The Chinese leadership, obviously, overplayed its cards. Peking refused to accept India's proposal to send neutral observers to the Sino-Sikkim border knowing that it will expose the hollowness of Peking's allegations.

The Peking leadership also exploited the events in regard to the Indo Pakistan conflict to attack the United Nations Organisation. The then United Nations Secretary General, U Thant, was described by the Chinese press as a "political broker of the United States". "The United Nations Organisation is a patron of the Indian aggressors," (*Jenmin Jihpao* said on September 14, 1965). All this was done with the aim of barring U Thant from attending the proposed second Afro-Asian conference.

Peking leaders' disruptive attempts reached a new peak of intensity during the course of active preparations for the conference. Many Chinese leaders visited Afro Asian countries in the years between 1963 and 1965 visiting some countries even several times in an attempt to disrupt the preparations for the conference.

The date of the conference was changed twice. Initially scheduled for March 10, 1965, the opening of the conference was first postponed to June 29 and then to November 5 of the same year. (The preparatory conference of the Foreign

Ministers of the participating countries was to open on October 28 1965) Every time the date of the conference was put off the Chinese leaders hoped that the conference would be held without any doubt though they themselves were creating hurdles for the conference to be convened

While trying to impose their stand on others the Chinese leaders kept on telling the Afro-Asian representatives about their common destinies" in a bid to conceal their real intention

Subsequent events however exposed the hypocrisy of the claim of the Chinese leadership and laid bare the serious differences dividing China and the overwhelming majority of Afro Asian countries Although China had lent its support to the idea of holding the conference at the proposed dates it suddenly submitted to the Preparatory Committee a proposal asking for postponing the conference indefinitely

This somersault taken by Peking was explained by the "unfavourable development in the international situation This demonstrated to the entire world the utter unscrupulousness of China in regard to its attitude towards the Third World and its total disregard of the vital interests of the countries of Asia and Africa which were instantly consigned to oblivion when Peking saw that its line was not going to get the support upon which it had banked

It became clear that in the international situation at that time the Chinese leadership saw no chance of achieving its chauvinistic aims at the conference of Afro-Asian countries China's relations with the leading Asian countries also deteriorated Peking had failed in its attempts to use the Indo-Pakistan conflict to undermine India's prestige in the Afro-Asian world The Chinese leadership's divisive plans were foiled by the Indo-Pak agreement to cease hostilities and accept the United Nations mediation and also by their favourable response to the good offices offered by the Soviet Union

The invitation to the United Nations Secretary General to attend the second Bandung also did not suit Peking

When Peking saw that its plans had misfired, it sent a message (October 22) saying that it would not attend the preparatory conference of Foreign Ministers if it was opened on October 28, as had been initially planned. This was an open ultimatum to Afro-Asian countries

At the same time, taking into account the objections raised by other members of the preparatory committee and apparently trying to slow their striving for "unity and consultations" with other countries, the Chinese representatives submitted a compromise proposal to convene a 'special' conference of Foreign Ministers to study the question of postponing or convening the conference. This proposal was rejected outright.

On October 26, the Government of China issued a statement saying that in the interests of "preserving Afro-Asian solidarity" it had decided "not to take part in the Afro-Asian conference on October 28, which could lead only to a split." The statement was full of baseless charges levelled against Algeria, the host country.

It said, in particular, that "Algeria", ignoring the proposal of a number of countries "had arbitrarily decided to convene on the scheduled date the second conference of the countries of Asia and Africa" that "the decision of Algeria taken in its capacity as chairman is a serious violation of the principle of attaining unity by way of consultations" and that this decision had allegedly "created a situation of division among the countries of Asia and Africa."

This statement brought out the fundamental differences between the aims set by China in relation to the conference, on the one hand, and by the Afro-Asian countries, on the other. The responsibility China had assumed in opposing the holding of the conference was taken note of by all these countries.

Algeria tried its best to convince China pointing out that should this conference be torpedoed it would mean imperialism had scored a victory over the Afro-Asian peoples. China however, turned a deaf ear to these appeals and entreaties.

This account of motivations of behaviour of China during the preparations for the holding of the second conference of Afro-Asian countries is of interest in the context of Peking's current postures in the international arena and its renewed vigorous efforts made to draw the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to its side under the slogan of "rallying Third World countries". It is noteworthy that during their contacts with representatives of the three continents the Chinese leaders persistently repeat the thesis that "China will never become a super power". Apart from the desire to allay the suspicions of developing countries about the hegemonistic aims of China's foreign policy, this phrase also camouflages the attempts made to overcome the unfavourable impressions made on these countries by the excesses Peking has committed in carrying out its great power course in the past, especially in the period of the preparations for the second Afro-Asian conference.

The sabotage of the second Bandung was the first attempt China had made to undermine the growing unity of the non-aligned nations in Asia and Africa. Both China and India were the founders of the Bandung Afro-Asian meeting where the Afro-Asian nations for the first time pledged for Panchsheel for the lasting unity of developing Afro-Asian countries. But it will go down in history that China betrayed the Bandung spirit by committing aggression on Indian soil and also in the second Bandung conference acted as saboteurs and became the renegade of fellow Afro-Asian Bandung spirit.

CHAPTER IV

Non-Alignment : Evolution and Progress

China's disruptive role and the West's open opposition and hostility could not prevent non alignment from growing into an international force of enormous magnitude. We will study here the genesis of the movement and its inherent vitality which has withstood critical situations and emerged reinigorated and strengthened from each crisis.

In order to understand the factors leading to the emergence of the non alignment movement, embracing the new states of Asia and Africa, it is necessary to recapitulate here the rapidly deteriorating international situation of the acute cold war period, threatening to break out into another war, in which the nations of Asia, and later of Africa achieved their national independence. The predominant force underlying the changes in these countries during those years was the upsurge of anti-colonial nationalism. Colonial countries like India, Indonesia, Vietnam and Thailand saw the emergence of strong anti colonial movements for national independence. Soon after West Asia also underwent a revolutionary upheaval expressing itself against the Palestinian policies of Western countries and their economic and political domination of the countries of the region.

(1) The new states were born with distrust of Western powers. This was due to the imperialist character of the

Non-Alignment: Evolution and Progress

latter's policies. Secondly, racial discrimination, which ^{have} been one of the facets of colonialism, had always stirred the wrath of subject peoples of the Orient. Thirdly, the social discrimination practised against the Negroes, the Mexicans and the Red Indians in the US was an unhappy reminder to the infant states that the ideals of the American Revolution and Civil War were honoured more in breach than in observance. The anti-colonial traditions of nationalist movements were, therefore, against alignment with Western powers.

These feelings of non-alignment with the West were reinforced by the fear that the defeated colonial powers might attempt to stage a back-door entry into the emancipated lands and imperil their hard-won independence. Proud and jealous of their freedom, conscious of their military and economic weakness, they tended to suspect every move to bring them into bloc alignment started off by Washington as a part of its worldwide policy of "containment", "roll-back", etc.

The policy of non-alignment was an offspring of strong sentiments of opposition to Western nationalism of these states. They saw in non-alignment, not only a guarantee of protecting and preserving their independence, but also an opportunity for greater importance and recognition in world affairs. This realisation deepened because their white colonial masters had denied them the right to play any role in the international scene. This relationship between anti-colonial nationalism and foreign policy based on non-alignment goes a long way to explain why non-alignment makes a tremendous mass appeal to the countries of Asia. It is significant to note that countries who have pursued a policy of non-alignment in world affairs are invariably those where the anti-colonial revolutions have succeeded. Where such revolutions have failed to mature properly or its success has been hampered, tendencies to pursue non-alignment remained dormant and weak.

Another factor leading to the acceptance of non alignment is economic. Long and bitter years of stagnation under colonial rule had spelled the ruin of the economies of many countries. The urge for modernisation and rapid economic and social development has been one of the prime motivations of nationalism in these countries. With the advent of independence, this urge became the watchword of resurgent nationalism in these countries. But the success of a policy of social and economic development within a country depends on peaceful conditions in the region to which it belongs as well as on peaceful conditions prevailing in the world. The fear of the outbreak of the third world war and for the desire peace, many states have agreed to disarmament and peaceful settlement of disputes. The support they give to the UN is largely based on the hope that this world organisation is the only workable mechanism for peaceful settlement of international disputes in the present context, though they also find in the world body an organ in which they are able to realise equality with other nations and a means of maximising their influence in world affairs.

The search for security has also been an important factor in popularising non alignment. The greatest menace to the freedom of these countries in modern times has been the Washington inspired cold war. Non alignment was seen to be the best possible guarantee by these states to preserve their national integrity and independence.

The years 1950-1954 can be described as the most formative period in the evolution of non alignment. This period saw a clear evolution and enunciation of the principle of non alignment. It was in this period that the cold war was intensified by the West and it escalated into a hot war in Korea. The outbreak of the war in this Asian country intensified the cold war on a global scale. The policy pursued by non aligned countries, especially by India, contributed to lessening of tensions and creating necessary atmosphere for peaceful nego-

tiations on the Korean question. The events in Korea and the common striving for peace helped to bring about a greater sense of unity among the newly liberated countries especially the Arab Asian countries, in the UN. The three agonising years of the Korean war, thus, marked the beginning of a more positive and creative orientation of non alignment.

The emergence of an Afro Asian group in the UN in these years, symbolised in the role of Mr Krishna Menon played in the lobbies of the comity of nations, marked an important development in the growth of non alignment. They evolved methods of consultation and cooperation on matters of common interest. They developed greater affinities and sympathies, closer understanding and collaboration with one another. They also developed fraternal relationship with the socialist community and some Latin American countries.

The years since 1954 saw the consolidation of the policy of non alignment on all fronts—in its popularity acceptance and recognition by great powers. The number of adherents to this policy has been increasing.

The crisis in Indo-China in 1954 was the second major occasion—after Korea—for the non aligned countries to demonstrate their resolute will for the preservation for peace in the world. The trend of events became no less ominous than they were in Korea when the basic question of liquidating colonialism came to be entangled with cold war politics which was given a sharp edge by the US determination to encircle the socialist and newly developed countries with a ring of military bases. It was in recognition of the efforts made by the non aligned nations to put the issue in its correct perspective that India was appointed Chairman of the International Commissions in Indo-China.

The Bandung Conference was an important landmark in the Afro-Asian history. Though it was not an exclusive conference of the non aligned nations, the leadership provided

by Nehru Nasser and Seokarno and the general tone of its declaration set at the conference was certainly of the non aligned nations It gave them an opportunity to meet discuss and evolve common understanding on world affairs

The outbreak of the Suez crisis in 1956 gave the non aligned nations another occasion to demonstrate their opposition to tripartite aggression The indignant and united voice of the non aligned nations supported by other socialist countries was largely responsible to save Egypt from aggression

A large number of Afro-Asian nations had received in this period active support from Soviet Union on questions of vital national importance India for example received open support on questions of Kashmir and Goa, Indonesia on West Irian issue and Egypt at the time of Suez crisis

During the following years the non aligned nations were consistently seeking to embody their broad assumptions about international relations in actual policies In urging the liquidation of colonialism from all parts of the world notably in Algeria and Angola in attempting to achieve through the UN and its associated bodies peaceful solutions to international problems and aid to underdeveloped states for their development programme in opposing the racist policies pursued by certain nations within their territories and in urging disarmament and banning of destructive nuclear weapons the non aligned nations tried to operate as a catalyst international force

The next important stage was the holding of summit conferences The non aligned nations were now holding their own conferences The number of participants went on increasing from 25 at Belgrade to 76 at Algiers The forthcoming summit at Colombo the first to be held in Asia is expected to be attended by over 80 countries The Government declared in September

1946 non alignment as the basis of its approach to contemporary international relations, India was practically the only country in the world to pursue that policy. Today, the number of non aligned nations has considerably increased. This tremendous growth has been from one main source—the new states of Asia and Africa, some of whom had declared non alignment as their policy at the Bandung Conference. The liberation of these countries had been won on the basis of nationalism which, as indicated earlier, was the major social phenomenon in the emergence of non alignment.

The real basis of the strength of non alignment can be seen in the colossal popular basis which the policy enjoys, not only in those countries where non alignment is pursued as official foreign policy, but also in a number of other countries in the underdeveloped world, in Latin American countries, and in liberal circles in more advanced countries of Europe like Britain, Norway, Sweden, etc. In the developing countries it is not accidental that governments which actively pursue non alignment are also governments which enjoy a large popular base as in India.

Another reason for further growth of non alignment during these years was due to the gradual evolution of its implications. Certain general propositions were derived at the beginning itself. These were largely inherent in the political experiences of these nations joined in the immediate past as a result of their opposition to colonialism and racialism, organising international assistance for economic development of the undeveloped and underdeveloped ones, urge for peace and disarmament, and support to the UN. While there were a number of issues on which the non aligned nations felt some difficulty in taking a definite stand from the very beginning because it required sometimes both time and experience for them to define their policies on a number of issues.

Another measure for the growth of non alignment was

the clearer distinction drawn between non alignment and neutrality. It was made clear that non alignment had nothing to do with neutrality or passivity. India was non aligned but not neutral. So was Egypt and others. This was best expressed by Nehru in 1949 when he declared "Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression takes place we cannot and shall not be neutral."

The opposition to imperialist military pacts further helped in the development of the concept of non alignment. The multilateral and bilateral military pacts were viewed as possible sources of danger to the security of non aligned countries. It was stated that these pacts would bring war to the doorsteps of Asian nations and imperil their sovereignty. The imperialist states were accused of taking sides in the disputes between the nations of the area with definite cold war and aggressive motives. It was rightly demanded that Asia should be kept out of cold war politics and maintained as an area of peace, which could then gradually be expanded to cover other parts of the world like Africa and so on.

One of the most important contributions to the concept of non alignment since 1953 has been that of Panchsheel. These principles were, in fact, a further elucidation of the policy rather than any addition to it. Whereas the non aligned and socialist countries supported these principles, the imperialist powers looked upon them with suspicion and distrust.

Five broad criteria were evolved on the basis of which invitations were sent to the countries inviting them to attend the non aligned summit. According to this criteria a non aligned nation should

- (1) follow an independent policy based on non alignment and peaceful coexistence
- (2) support liberation movements,

- (3) not be a member of any multilateral military pact in the context of the 'East-West' struggle,
- (4) not be a member of a bilateral military pact in the "East-West" struggle,
- (5) not grant military bases to foreign powers

Non alignment received a rude shock when China sought to disrupt the unity of the Third World, gave consent to United States continued presence in South East Asia, opposed disarmament and tried to weaken the developing countries' growing unity with socialist nations. Despite this setback, non alignment has grown into a powerful movement and its total impact has been towards contributing to the stability and maintenance of world peace, preserving national independence and national interests of these countries.

This has been made possible by two developments. First, the nuclear monopoly of the US was broken by the USSR, which drew level with the largest imperialist power in military prowess, and the socialist and developing countries emerged as a powerful force on the world scene, no longer confined to the frontiers of one single state. Secondly, the UN underwent a change with the entry of a large number of newly independent African states. As most of these countries were non aligned, the opinions of the young states gained in weight in this world forum. The imperialist powers were, therefore, compelled to take note of the growing strength of non aligned nations.

CHAPTER V

Non-alignment to Safeguard Against Imperialism

Non alignment is a new concept in international relations. It was born, and snowballed into a powerful movement, in the conditions of collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, spectacular growth in the freedom struggle of the oppressed peoples, and consolidation of the world socialist system. It was a response, in the domain of foreign policy, to the strategy of imperialism to inveigle the newly independent states in political and military entanglements from which they had secured their release after a long and tortuous struggle. It was also a response to Western plans of setting up aggressive military pacts, in the name of "anti communism", directed against the national interests of Afro-Asian states, endangering their security and threatening to turn their lands into battle-grounds where "Asians fight against Asians." Non alignment was deliberately equated by interested quarters with neutrality in order to rob it of its growing appeal to a wider spectrum of world political opinion, and secondly, to blunt the sharp edge of its consistent anti imperialism.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of the policy of non-alignment, made it abundantly clear that it was the bedrock of the foreign policy of newly independent countries, ensur-

ing external conditions for their national renaissance and growth, for world peace needed to carry out their national plans of economic and social progress held back by centuries of colonial rule. He emphasised its positive anti-war role time and again. His undying words still ring in the ears of every Asian and African patriot.

We have to build in our countries societies where freedom is essential, because freedom will give us strength and enable us to build prosperous societies. There are for us basic problems. If we cannot prevent war, all our problems suffer and we cannot deal with them. But if we can prevent war, we can go ahead in solving our other problems. Not only is this incumbent on us but if we do this, we shall be in line with the thinking of millions and millions of people. Non-alignment has received strength from the fact that millions of peoples are not aligned and that they do not want war.

'When we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously we mean non-alignment with military blocs. It is not a negative policy. It is a positive one, a definite one, and I hope, a dynamic one.'

Non-alignment accords with the national interests of the newly independent countries. It provides a favourable situation in the present international climate for reshaping their national economy and for effecting the necessary social and economic change. Non-alignment is most effective, as India has shown, when it is backed up by a progressive, independent internal policy as steadfastly pursued by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Following this policy, a number of non-aligned countries have established close friendly relations with the USSR and thus severely restricted imperialism's power to manoeuvre. The most brilliant example of this is the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation signed in 1971. This treaty not only juridically seals the

close and deep bonds of friendship forged between our two countries but also serves as a powerful lever of peace in South East Asia and the entire continent. It maps out a vast horizon of cooperation between the largest non aligned country and the world's first socialist state. Indians remember how passionately Jawaharlal Nehru spoke, even before independence about the need for coming closer to Russia not only because it is our immediate neighbour, not only because it is a great power, but also, as he said so often it represents a "new civilisation, a new torch showing the way out to people living under the dark rule of imperialism. The non aligned countries naturally find in the USSR a stable sincere and dependable ally in their struggle for building new lives sought to be smothered by world imperialism and by its local henchmen. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, likewise have been staunch supporters of non alignment. On their part they see in it vast potentialities for broadening the worldwide front against imperialism, aggression and war, for widening zones of peace, and for restructuring the international order which until recently had largely depended on imperialist diktat.

Nehru's abiding faith in non alignment as an independent policy of new states, playing an effective role in a world whose skies were murkied by war clouds was shared by other Asian and African statesmen. For instance, declared Kenneth Kaunda

"The declared policy of my country, Zambia, is one of non alignment. This does not mean that we wish to be isolated from the rest of the world nor does it mean that we practice neutralism. What it does mean is that we wish to be free to make our own assessment in matters which affect us and, having done so, to be able to make our own decision

Non alignment is no more a mere concept but a dynamic policy which reveals its new characteristics as fresh tasks

crop up in changing historical conditions. Today, the non alignment policy means not just non alignment to the existing military political blocs, but vigorous activity to strengthen international security. The fact that the non aligned countries are working together with socialist states and all peace loving forces for the practical implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence and programme of general and complete disarmament demonstrates the progressive nature of their foreign policy. Today, non alignment means determination to rule out the use of force in international relations and to eliminate the existing hotbeds of tension before they flare up into a world war.

A distinctive feature of the foreign policy of non aligned countries is that they are not neutral in any confrontation between the aggressive policy of imperialism and the peaceful policy of the forces of progress, shunning the urgent problems of peace, disarmament and the development of the backward regions of the world, said Doudou Thiam of Senegal in his book *The Foreign Policy of African States* (London, 1965, p. 80).

Non alignment implies something more than observance of its principles by the great majority of developing countries which have officially proclaimed them as the basis of their foreign policy. It is also manifested in the progress recently observed in those developing countries which, formally, were not non aligned. Even in countries which were earlier drawn by imperialists into military political blocs, the movement to break with the imperialist policy of aggression and military ventures and to pursue an independent foreign policy is spreading.

The constructive influence of the non alignment movement is also demonstrated in Latin America's foreign policy trends. Although many countries of this region are tied with the USA by the 1948 Inter American Agreement on Mutual

Non-Alignment Legacy of Nehru

Defence, which has a definite influence on their foreign policy, some of them are working with increasing determination for international security, economic progress, and establishment of diplomatic relations and promotion of extensive economic ties with the socialist countries. The attempts of US imperialism to restrict the national sovereignty of Latin American countries are increasingly arousing the resistance of those states. This resistance in Latin America is led by revolutionary Cuba, by the great Fidel Castro, a staunch friend of India, an advocate of peace, progress and socialism.

The non alignment policy followed by developing countries is not an unchangeable concept. Being in a process of constant evolution, it includes a very wide range of ideas and subtleties in relation to the major issues of international relations. The differences in practical implementation of the principles of non alignment are still present. This is because of the political, ideological, socio-economic and other conditions prevailing in various countries and geographical areas. Among the non aligned countries there are those which have proclaimed socialism as their ultimate aim, those which have taken the road of non socialist development, and those which are still semi feudal monarchies.

A number of progressive countries, like India, are consistently following the non alignment policy. They have combined their active, independent foreign policy with fundamental internal social, economic and political changes as demonstrated by Mrs. Indira Gandhi's 20-Point Programme which has galvanised the entire nation. Despite differences, all developing countries are united by the common aims of easing international tensions, ensuring peaceful coexistence, shunning aggressive blocs and combating imperialism and colonialism. It is not to be expected that non alignment will mean a uniform policy for all its adherents on all occasions. It represents a broad similarity in the approach of young states to the contemporary international situation. What is

important is that developing countries are pursuing a foreign policy which is entirely different from that of Western powers, especially in the matter of peace and international security. The non alignment policy deprives the militarist circles of the West of the vast reserves from which they used to draw manpower and material resources for their war ventures. That is why the imperialists are trying hard to hamper the progressive development of the foreign policy pursued by newly freed nations. They are putting strong pressure on many of these countries to remould their foreign policy and change its anti imperialist trend. We must not underestimate imperialism's military political and economic pressure which is attempting to impede the progress of the non aligned movement as well as the advance of these nations.

The unity of the non aligned around the programme they have evolved at the Bandung Conference and at four summits has become an eyesore to Western imperialism. It is, therefore, sought to be disrupted through means as diabolical as the nature of imperialism.

The most sinister forces of imperialists have tried to scare the non aligned countries by unfurling the torn and tattered banner of "anti marxism". The bogey of anti communism was trotted out, apart from other reasons, to prevent the Third World from coming closer to its natural anti imperialist ally, the USSR and the socialist countries. An attempt is made even today to pump fresh blood into this dead and decomposed body in order to bring about a rift in their ever growing friendly relations. This is also used as a shield to protect some of the most pro-imperialist Afro-Asian regimes known for their renowned hostility to people's march towards social and economic progress.

W. W. Kulsky, an American foreign policy expert says

"The crisis of the colonial system and the movement for the modernisation of retarded societies would have occurred

quite independent of communism and the communist movement" (*International Politics in a Revolutionary Age*, p 334)

In the failure of its policy of "anti communism" vis a vis developing nations, imperialism, in fact, has lost in its global struggle for people's minds. The people of the world have seen through the game, they have seen what imperialism stands for and what socialism offers to them in their struggle for banishing poverty from their lives. Prof. Galbraith, former US Ambassador in India, said "Many of the governments of the new countries have embraced socialism and planning as a matter of conviction. Capitalism has come to mean British, French, Dutch or American companies that were associated with colonial rule. Or, as in Africa, it denotes the merchants and traders—also usually foreigners. These are firmly identified in people's minds with high prices, high profits and a good deal of sanguinary swindling" (*Economics, Peace and Laughter*, 1972, p 1974)

To the people of Africa and Asia the USA and the USSR are not just two great powers but two opposite ways of life, two different civilisations, two different approaches to the rebuilding of social. As Hans J Morgenthau wrote

"The United States and the Soviet Union face each other not only as two great powers. They also face each other as the fountain heads of two hostile and incompatible ideologies, systems of government and ways of life" (*Foreign Affairs*, April 1969, pp 428-29)

Morgenthau goes on to argue that it is this that forms the "dynamic force" behind imperialist policies of intervention "all over the globe, sometimes surreptitiously, sometimes openly, sometimes with the accepted methods of diplomatic pressure and propaganda, sometimes with the frowned upon instruments of covert subversion and open force" (*Ibid.*)

The USA's "awesome" military muscle flexed from time to time, has not been able to cow down the non aligned peoples nor won it their allegiance and loyalty. Even Western scholars have lost faith in the potentialities of imperialists armed might in pushing forward the Western foreign policy. As Seymour Melman writes

"most of us have agreed with Voltaire that God is on the side with the heaviest battalions. If it were true that the strongest military power always gets its way, then the United States possessor of the greatest stock of nuclear military weapons in the world should be able to exercise its will among other nations with substantial success. But this has not been the case. military power is becoming increasingly ineffective as an instrument of international policy." (Our Depleted Society, p 157)

Western statesmen have thus come to accept the fact that power no longer translates automatically into influence (Agenda for the Nations, New York). The role the masses have played in upsetting imperialism's calculations have also been acknowledged by them. Walter Lippman for instance wrote

"Mass opinion has acquired mounting power in this country. It has shown itself to be a dangerous master of decisions when the stakes are life and death." (The Public Philosophy, p 20)

The people of the Third World have come to see clearly the ugly fact of imperialism. It holds no attraction to the people who have shaken off the fetters of colonialism or are still fighting for their independence from Western rule. Faced with the choice of path of further development these people do not see in the traditional Western form an accepted social model. The reality of world imperialism—which unleashed a barbarous war in Vietnam which subjugates the peoples of African countries and which holsters the rule of rabid racia

list—can no longer be hidden from the people of developing countries "Some smart boy on Madison Avenue," said Dr McLain, an American missionary in Peru, "ought to dream up another word for capitalism because capitalism has become a dirty word all over the world" (Quoted by Walter Joyce in *Propaganda Gap*, p 82)

This is the opinion not of a mere unsophisticated US missionary The late Senator Robert F Kennedy, likewise, noted that capitalism had become "the dirty word of the Orient" inspite of all American propaganda and economic aid (*Just Friends and Brave Enemies*, p 118)

What nauseates the non aligned peoples most about the reality of world imperialism is its frontal opposition to their endeavours for remoulding their lives on new lines, for building their future from the debris left behind by colonialism Progress is anathema to imperialism as Holy Water is to Satan "Nicholas I of Russia is said to have issued an order banning the word 'progress' now a-days the philosophers and historians of Western Europe, and even the United States, have come belatedly to agree with him" (E H Carr, *What is History?*, p 37)

World imperialism has outworn itself, it no longer meets the social requirements of the peoples of the West and of the Third World

Imperialism however has not exhausted its armoury of tricks to try to cloud the minds of the people of developing countries In its desperate bid to retouch its image and to paint the socialist countries in the blackest of colours, it takes recourse to spinning "theories", telling blatant lies, and, what is most disgusting to open intimidation The methods used are crude and subtle, open and hidden political and not so political Some "Socialists among the imperialists continue to sing doggedly the old plaintive refrain of "anti-communism" As shown earlier its pining tune is no longer popular and, consequently, new tunes are played

It is tragic, indeed, that the leaders of the People's Republic of China, an Asian country, should lend imperialism all the support it needs to besmurch the fair name of a true friend of the Third World. Imperialist deception, however, cuts no ice with the non aligned countries for their people now no longer depend entirely on Western media for knowing the truth about the socialist sector of the world.

There was a time when, at the height of the cold war, Dulles dubbed the non aligned movement "immoral". This crude denunciation has now been replaced by an elaborate sophistry. For example, Cecil V. Crabb Jr., a well known writer, stated that "from the 1940s to the 1960s, State Department thinking changed from the belief that neutrality was immoral or otherwise unacceptable to the idea that at worst was inevitable" (The Elephants and the Grass, p. 172).

Such a "recognition" of non alignment does not however, imply reconciliation to it. Imperialism has changed its tactics, not the strategy, endeavouring to ensure that non alignment sheds its progressive anti imperialist essence, that it does not develop further solidarity with the socialist countries. Imperialists for instance, cook up theories—beefed up with Chinese additions—that the world is divided into "rich" and "poor" nations. No account is taken of the social set up of the "rich" and "poor" nations, of the sources and causes of their richness and poverty. The meaning of the pseudo-scientific doctrine is expressed in its basic postulate which states that the developing states must "keep away from the West and the East". It is not an innocent postulate: it has sinister implications and ulterior motives. It seeks to attain the political objective of equating before the non aligned world the imperialist policy of militarism and war, of butressing the remnants of colonialism and centres of racialism of blatant aggression against the newly independent nations. Imperialism's efforts are obviously aimed at driving a wedge

between the non aligned countries and socialist commonwealth, at breaking up their powerful united front

The aim of splitting up the united anti imperialist front of developing and socialist countries, and of isolating and weakening the non aligned movement, is evident in the widely advocated proposition that the non aligned nations are destined to be mere pawns in the "great power game", in which they are "a kind of bridge between two competing camps" (Non-Alignment in the World of Today, Beograd, p 237)

In their efforts to emasculate the non aligned movement, to rob it of its original character which has made it into a powerful international force in order to defeat its striving for international peace and detente, for consolidating national independence, and for eradicating economic backwardness, imperialist theoreticians project it as a policy of "defeatism, escapism, or lack of realism on the part of its adherents" (The Elephants and the Grass, p 65) as "a manifestation of diplomatic indecision and equivocation" (Ibid, pp 10-11) The US foreign policy theoretician, Hans J Morgenthau, goes further and evaluates the non aligned movements as "moral indifference to global issues" ("A Critical Look at Neutrality," The New York Times Magazine, August, 27, 1961, p 25)

Every unbiased person will see that these assertions are as far from truth as are the designs and deeds of their authors from the real interests of the non aligned countries. Subsequent pages will show how non alignment came to be identified with the forces actively working to resolve the "global issues" in a peaceful way how it threw its entire weight on the side of those who sought to defeat imperialism's bid to kindle a nuclear conflagration who made every attempt to evolve a new world order based on equality among states, big as well as small, and peace and peace among nations. The idea recently

between the non aligned countries and socialist common wealth, at breaking up their powerful united front

The aim of splitting up the united anti imperialist front of developing and socialist countries, and of isolating and weakening the non aligned movement, is evident in the widely-advocated proposition that the non aligned nations are destined to be mere pawns in the "great power game", in which they are "a kind of bridge between two competing camps" (*Non-Alignment in the World of Today*, Beograd, p 237)

In their efforts to emasculate the non aligned movement, to rob it of its original character which has made it into a powerful international force, in order to defeat its striving for international peace and detente, for consolidating national independence and for eradicating economic backwardness, imperialist theoreticians project it as a policy of "defeatism, escapism, or lack of realism on the part of its adherents" (*The Elephants and the Grass*, p 65), as 'a manifestation of diplomatic indecision and equivocation' (*Ibid.*, pp 10-11) The US foreign policy theoretician, Hans J Morgenthau, goes further and evaluates the non aligned movements as "moral indifference to global issues" ("A Critical Look at Neutrality," *The New York Times Magazine*, August, 27, 1961, p 25)

Every unbiased person will see that these assertions are as far from truth as are the designs and deeds of their authors from the real interests of the non aligned countries. Subsequent pages will show how non alignment came to be identified with the forces actively working to resolve the 'global issues' in a peaceful way, how it threw its entire weight on the side of those who sought to defeat imperialism's bid to kindle a nuclear conflagration, who made every attempt to evolve a new world political order based on equality among states, big as well as small, on peace and peaceful coexistence

The idea recently propounded in the West of differen

uating between the developing countries by counter posing the economically more developed to the less developed ones is, likewise, aimed at undermining the unity of the non-aligned. The differences arising from geographical and socio-economic conditions are no obstacles to the unity of non aligned countries. They have united for peace and progress no matter what the difficulties may be.

The open calls given for changing the platform of non-alignment, for diluting its basic principles, allegedly to make it "acceptable to the various groups of countries," are attempts at pushing developing countries off their chosen path. However, the unity of action achieved by non aligned countries against imperialism and neo-colonialism is getting stronger day after day. The objective basis for their unity is determined by their past by the common role assigned to them by history. They are all wedded to the path of peace and peaceful coexistence, to friendship with anti imperialist movements the world over, and, above all, with the socialist countries. If China has chosen to be outside their ranks it is its own doing and fully in consonance with the retrograde role it is playing on the world scene.

In the changed world of today when detente has become the dominant trend in international relations—when colonialism is on the retreat, and when the freedom movements in subject countries are assuming a broader and wider sweep, the imperialists are seeking to subjugate the non-aligned countries through a variety of means ranging from using the instruments of inequitable economic and political relations to open attempts at destabilisation as evidenced in India recently. The leaders of the non aligned countries today, especially Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, are stressing the need to be on alert against foreign imperialist interference in the internal affairs of Third World countries. Non alignment today is a powerful and irreplaceable instrument of the struggle of the peoples for safeguarding their hard won

freedom for bringing about radical changes in the existing inequitable economic and political relations among the states of the world, and for peace and security in the world. Imperialist forces continue to impede efforts made by developing and peace-loving countries to secure their rightful place in the international community. The dogged attempt the US is making to deny India its rightful place in South East Asia is a classic example. Washington has left no stone unturned to weaken India internationally as well as in the region to which it belongs. Our growing economic and military strength—even the detonation of our nuclear device for peaceful purposes—was looked upon with open hostility. Obviously, the chief target of the attack of these external forces, bent upon keeping India weak and backward, is its great leader Mrs. Indira Gandhi who, following in the footsteps of her father, is rallying the nation for its re-birth, for wiping out the age old poverty of its people left to them by colonialism as a legacy.

Mrs. Gandhi has been consistently warning the nation against the blatantly exploitative character of imperialism. She does not mince her words. She identifies the external forces posing a threat to the security of India, to social and economic progress, to the very stability of its politico-parliamentary order.

From Chile to Angola, such is the frightfully large canvas which imperialism has chosen as its sphere for intervention. Legally constituted governments are forcibly ousted by terror and violence. Internal disaffection and dissensions are sown on a wide scale. Politics of assassination and the cult of violence are frequently preached and practised. Imperialism stoops to these methods through bribery, corruption, subversion and conspiracy in total disregard of international law and civilised behaviour. The danger of foreign imperialist intervention is becoming greater, for non-aligned nations which, newly liberated as they are, still are not strong poli-

tically, economically and militarily. The non aligned world is, therefore, imperialism's most obvious target.

A few more words about the doctrine of destabilisation are called for here. This doctrine was first employed and later openly advocated in Chile. The US imperialists have not felt shy of admitting openly that it is their inalienable right to intervene in the internal affairs of countries whose political and economic regimes are not to their liking. It was against this background that the former US Ambassador in New Delhi, Prof. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, sent a telegram to the US Secretary of State about the apprehensions voiced by Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

It is precisely because she (Prime Minister Indira Gandhi) is not innocent, not squeamish and not a moraliser that her concern about American intentions is real and immediate. And of course, the news from the US, as printed in the Indian press, repeatedly confirms her worst suspicions and genuine fears. She thinks we are a profoundly selfish and cynical counter revolutionary power.

Do not think, fellow Americans, of beguiling Indira Gandhi with talk of cultural exchange, joint industrial undertakings or a few shiploads of cheap food. Her concern is not economic. It is political. Nothing will change her until she is satisfied that the United States accepts her India.

Her concern is whether the US accepts the Indian regime. She is not sure but that we would be content to see others like her overthrown. She knows fully well that we have done our share and more of bloody and dishonourable deeds." (The New York Times, September 13, 1974)

The indroads imperialism is seeking to make in the internal socio-political structure of non aligned countries, openly as well as through internal reaction, is fought back

by the national leadership and by the people of the country concerned and, collectively, by their emerging unity at the non aligned summits, in the UN and at other world forums. The increasing unity of the non aligned, the close identity in their approach with that of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on burning problems of the day—from war in Vietnam to events in Middle East, from condemning colonialism to branding Zionism with racialism from demanding dismantling of imperialist bases in the Indian Ocean to recognising the Palestine Liberation Organisation—have thrown the imperialist ruling circles into a fit of frenzy. Particularly distressing to them is what they call the ‘tyranny of vote’ of the non aligned in the UN, i.e., their united assertion of will against the manoeuvring of the West. In these ‘block votes’, as the US calls it, Moynihan, according to *Times* magazine, perceived anti Americanism and onslaughts against the West. The representatives of the Third World countries had a good laugh at the tantrum he threw at their successful attempt to have the PLO delegation admitted to the UN sessions. “This showed a totalitarian disregard for due process threatening to turn the UN into an empty shell,” he thundered. In a broadside against the Third-World and socialist countries, Moynihan, in one of the Security Council sessions, delivered a lecture on their system of government. The representative of Saudi Arabia, by no means an inveterate enemy of America, stood up to say “Time has come to make it clear to Mr Moynihan that he could not treat UN members in such a cavalier manner.” The Saudi Arabian representative asked for floor to chide Mr Moynihan for his “unwarranted remarks.” Noting that Mr Moynihan was leaving the chamber, the Saudi Arabian representative called out “Mr Professor, please do not go out. You may learn something from what I have to say, Mr Professor”. Mr Moynihan, however, did not return. The Saudi Arabian representative referred to Mr Moynihan’s leaked telegram

to the State Department justifying the US policy to get tough with the Third-World countries and said someone ought to make it clear to him that he "could not treat sovereign states in a cavalier fashion" (Times of India, January 31, 1976)

The crescendo of this outburst against the Third World War reached in US Secretary of State Dr Kissinger's statement in Boston on March 11, 1976, editorially called 'Kissingeries' by the Indian Express (March 15, 1976) Dr Kissinger had picked up Moynihan's odious mantle, the paper wrote The Secretary of State had said at Boston that some non-aligned countries were 'extorting' what "industrial democracies had freely offered" He added "Lop-sided voting, unworkable resolutions and arbitrary procedure too often dominate the UN and other international bodies Nations which originally choose non alignment to shield themselves from the global coalitions have themselves formed a rigid ideological confrontationist coalition of theirs. One of the most evident blocs in the world body today is ironically the automatic alignment of the non aligned." This tirade in Boston, as the Indian Express wrote editorially, was what Moynihan would have gleefully called 'raising hell' with the Third-World countries for their audacity to outveto the US at the UN on vital questions Dr Kissinger was not showing a totally new trait At the Milwaukee Institute of World Affairs in July last, he had uttered a warning that the USA might hold its financial contribution to the UN if the Third World countries indulged in 'lop-sided, loaded voting, biased results and arbitrary tactics' He had accused the Third World countries of "adolescent posturing." Dr Kissinger could not have been unaware that manipulation of votes at the UN was an act which was begun and practiced by the US And if anyone is guilty of lop-sided voting, it is the US which is still using its veto in the Security Council to frustrate near unanimous decisions of the General Assembly.

Weeks after Dr Kissinger delivered his blasts at the

Third World countries, the USA vetoed in the Security Council their resolution deploring Israeli policies in Jerusalem and in the occupied areas on the West Bank of the Jordan River. Formulated by a group of Third-World countries in the Security Council, the resolution had "deplored Israel's failure to put a stop to action and policies tending to change the status of the city of Jerusalem" The resolution, an innocuous one, had called upon Israel to refrain from taking steps against Arab inhabitants of occupied areas, to respect the inviolability of the holy places and to desist from the expropriation of Arab land or from the establishment of Israeli settlements on it

What also sends the imperialists into a fit of frenzy is that the Third World countries, believing in peace and peaceful co-existence, solve their inter state disputes themselves without turning to Western chancelleries for "adjudication" and "arbitration" Students of current affairs are well aware of the fact that the colonial rule bequeathed to the newly-liberated countries numerous problems causing sharp disagreement among them The questions of just and effective settlement of territorial disputes are of enormous importance to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. According to the estimates of the US News & World Report, of 128 conflicts about 100 took place between 1898 and 1968 in Asia, Africa and the Middle East The peaceful resolution of these conflicts goes to strengthen the unity of the Third World countries especially when it is remembered that colonialism had artificially divided or conversely "united" within the framework of their territorial possessions people of different tribes and ethnic tribes with different religions, cultures and levels of development. The imperialist powers had, for instance, torn up 'the living body of Africa' as Jack Woddis wrote in *The New Way Ahead* (p 150) 'Faced in the past decade with a growing insistence by the African people that they be allowed to rule themselves, British imperialism had

worked hard to play on every division and backward looking force,' he added

Many territorial conflicts in the Third World countries still bear the stamp of the global political ambitions of the US and of the scramble of other Western nations for spheres of influence. We in India are painfully aware of the attempts US imperialism made, in conjunction with China, to stoke the fires of armed confrontation in the Indian sub-continent to the detriment of the peace and security of its peoples. The menacing proximity of the US 7th Fleet to Indian shores was held out as a threat to our country. The historic role the 1971 friendship treaty between our country and the USSR played in warding off the external danger to India is now well known. What the 1971 events showed clearly was that the non aligned nations could rely safely and securely on the USSR as a shield against the threats of aggression and for protecting the peace and security of South East Asia and of the entire East.

Imperialism keeps waging wars against small countries in order to smother their cherished desire for freedom, to deprive them of their independence and to subjugate them to its rule. This explains the origin of the brutal wars launched against Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, of supporting the expansionist desire of Israel against the vital interests of the Arab peoples. Vietnam, however, has proclaimed both the predatory character of imperialism as well as its inherent weakness to crush an awakened and united people backed by all non aligned countries, by the peace loving forces of the world and above all by the political, economic and military might of the USSR and the socialist camp.

There is another stratagem imperialism uses to weaken the Third World countries. It is one of utilising the programme and policies of certain internal reactionary segments of political life which have placed themselves in opposition

to the social and economic aspirations of the people of developing countries. These groups play into the hands of hostile external forces and become their instruments in turning back the wheel of progress set in motion by the national leadership of the country. Imperialism and local reaction in Third-World countries enter into a pact with each other, with the latter playing a subservient role.

"Some regimes and political organisations in the Third-World countries which have proclaimed socialist aims and carry out progressive changes", as L. I. Brezhnev stated in his Report to the 25th CPSU Congress, "have come under strong pressure from internal and foreign reaction." "The recent rightist campaign against the Government of Indira Gandhi," he added, "and the attempts to undermine the social and political gains of the Egyptian revolution are examples of this course of events."

Such is the balance sheet of imperialism vis-a-vis the non-aligned world.

The developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America emerged on the international scene as a powerful force at a time when the contradictions between the socialist and capitalist systems had assumed an acute form. The process of this emergence was further stepped up and taken on to a qualitatively new height by the participation of the young independent states in solving several international problems. The main factor which helped non-alignment movement gain immense prestige and powerful momentum was its consistent anti-imperialist orientation. Non-aligned countries contributed a good deal in solving some international issues, in helping evolve mankind's answer to the problems posed by nuclear war and stockpiling of arms, in changing the very drift of international affairs from one of confrontation to co-operation, from cold war to detente. Of course, they have not relented in their struggle against colonialism and im-

perialism which still try to turn back the wheel of history as events in Chile showed

An attempt is made—of course, with the active and willing help of China—to split the anti imperialist front of the non aligned by disseminating the spurious theory that the non aligned have to maintain an equidistance from the two super powers” What the authors of this theory” deliberately omit to mention is that on the world arena the battle-lines are drawn between the forces of socialism and national liberation on the one hand and the forces of imperialism and reaction on the other, which include the USA The Soviet people continue to stand, as L I Brezhnev declared, on the side of the forces of progress, democracy and national independence, and regard them as friends and comrades in struggle” The Soviet leader added Glancing at the picture of the modern world one cannot help noticing the important fact that the influence of states that had only recently been colonies or semi colonies had grown considerably

“It may definitely be said about the majority of them that they are defending their political and economic rights against imperialism with mounting energy striving to consolidate their independence and to raise the social, economic and cultural level of their people

The foreign policy of the developing countries has become visibly more active This is seen in many spheres—the political course of the non aligned movement, and the activity of the Organisation of African Unity and of the various economic associations formed by developing countries”

“With the present correlation of class forces in the world, the liberated countries were quite capable of resisting imperialist diktat and achieving just—that is, equal—economic relations.” He declared

“It is also clear that their contribution to the common struggle for peace and the security of peoples which is

already considerable is quite likely to become more substantial

" We again emphasise that the Soviet Union fully supports the legitimate aspirations of the young states, their determination to shake off all imperialist exploitation, and to take full charge of their entire national wealth

"We are drawn closer to the vast majority of the states that arose on the ruins of the colonial system by our deep common allegiance to peace and freedom, and by aversion to all forms of aggression and domination and to exploitation of one country by another. The community of basic aspirations in the rich and fruitful soil on which our friendship will continue to grow and flourish

"The Soviet Union has commanded our respect and admiration from the early days. The Great October Revolution and the mass struggles which preceded it, had a profound impact on national liberation movements all over the world. We saw in it a historic turning point on the road towards a brighter future for all mankind. Our Indian Revolution followed its own distinctive path. But from the beginning the Soviet Union's understanding and sympathy towards the struggle of colonial and newly freed peoples was evident. There has been a similarity of outlook between our two countries regarding such questions and other international issues and the area of mutual understanding has steadily enlarged."

Non alignment and world socialism are thus close and firm allies, each helping the other, in the common cause of keeping the earth clean from the garbage of imperialism, colonial and neo-colonial domination, racialism and stock piling of arms. These two mighty world forces work, jointly and with mutual confidence, at the UN and other world bodies in pursuit of these laudable objectives to the chagrin and dismay of imperialism and, of course, Peking which keeps on howling as the world people's caravan moves on towards a better international order

Summits : From Belgrade To Algiers

The non aligned countries have so far held four summits at Belgrade (1961), Cairo (1964), Lusaka (1970) and Algiers (1973) The first summit conference was attended by 25 countries, the second by 45 Asian and African countries, Yugoslavia, Cuba and observers from some Latin American states, the third by 61 countries, and the fourth by 76 countries and 16 national liberation movements At the dawn of non alignment there were only 25 countries adhering to this course The number has steadily increased, thus showing the wide sweep the movement has assumed Besides, the years have shown the inherent vitality and maturity of the movement, creating favourable conditions for developing countries in their struggle against imperialism which is growing more decrepit and, at the same time, more frenzied and ferocious Besides, the process of relaxation of international tension eases the struggle of the non aligned serving as a catalyst in giving their dynamic foreign policy a more vigorous push

The conferences at Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers were significant landmarks in the struggle of the Third World against imperialism It was a struggle which gained added strength with the support of the socialist countries Imperia-

lism was forced to reckon with non alignment as an important factor in world politics

The conference held at Belgrade was attended, among others by observers from three Latin American countries which indicated beyond any measure of doubt that the ideas of non alignment first formulated by India had crossed the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and begun to grip the minds and hearts of the people of Latin American continent

The Declaration unanimously adopted at the Belgrade Conference stated that lasting peace could be achieved only if the domination of colonialism imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations was eliminated and the policy of peaceful co-existence was accepted and practised in the world It affirmed the non aligned nations' "unwavering faith" that the international community should organise its life without resorting to means which belonged to a past epoch of human history The Declaration stated unambiguously that the principles of peaceful co-existence were the only alternative to Cold War and to a nuclear catastrophe The only basis of all international relations should be based on principles which include the right of peoples to self-determination to independence and to free determination of the forms and methods of economic social and cultural development

The Belgrade Declaration has enormous significance for the world of today for it stresses that as global peace and stability depend on the mutual relations of great powers, the non aligned countries consider "it a matter of principle that the Great Powers take more determined action for the solving of various problems by means of negotiations" The participants in the Belgrade Conference considered it essential for non-aligned nations to take part in solving outstanding international issues concerning world peace and security as "none of them can remain unaffected by or indifferent to these issues"

The non aligned nations' meeting at Belgrade reaffirmed their support to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted at the 15th session of the UN General Assembly and recommended the immediate unconditional, total and final abolition of colonialism and resolved to make a concerted effort to put an end to all types of colonialism and imperialist domination in all forms and manifestations. They also demanded that an immediate stop be put to armed action and repressive measures against dependent peoples to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence and that the integrity of their national territory should be respected. Any aid given by any country to a colonial power, the Declaration read, in such suppression is contrary to the UN Charter. The conference demanded the immediate termination of all colonial occupation and restoration of the territorial integrity to the rightful people in countries in which it has been violated in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as the withdrawal of foreign forces from their national soil.

The Belgrade Conference condemned the imperialist policies pursued in the Middle East and declared its support for full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine in conformity with the Charter and resolutions of the UN.

It condemned the policy of apartheid practised by the Union of South Africa and demanded the immediate abandonment of this policy. It declared that the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constitutes a grave violation of UN Charter and of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

The non aligned countries, which have had a rich past of anti imperialism and anti colonialism, went on record at Belgrade declaring that the establishment and maintenance of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries,

particularly against their express will, is a gross violation of the sovereignty of such states. They declared their full support to countries which are endeavouring to secure the vacation of these bases. The conference called upon imperialist states maintaining foreign bases to consider seriously their abolition "as a contribution to world peace".

The Belgrade meet also affirmed that disarmament was an "imperative need and the most urgent task of mankind". The Declaration stated that a radical solution of this problem, which had become an urgent necessity in the present stage of armaments, could be achieved only by means of a general and complete disarmament. The conference came out in favour of total prohibition of nuclear arms and bacteriological and chemical weapons. It called upon the Great Powers to sign "without further delay" a treaty for general and complete disarmament "in order to save mankind from the scourge of war and release energy and resources now being spent on armaments to be used for the peaceful economic and social development of all mankind".

The Belgrade Conference also adopted an important document entitled "Danger of War and Appeal for Peace". It stated that, in order to avoid the calamity of a nuclear war, it was "urgent and imperative" that the USSR and the USA should "resume negotiations for a peaceful settlement of any outstanding differences between them with due regard to the principles of the UN Charter and continue negotiating until both they and the rest of the world achieve total disarmament and enduring peace". The non-aligned countries declared in the statement "While decisions leading to war or peace at present rest with these Great Powers the consequences affect the entire world. All nations and peoples have, therefore, an abiding concern and interest that the approaches and actions of the Great Powers should be such as to enable mankind to move forward to peace and prosperity and not

to the doom of extinction" The conference, therefore, appealed to the governments of the USSR and the USA "to make most immediate and direct approaches to each other to avert the imminent conflict and establish peace"

The non aligned conference sent identically worded letters to the heads of government of the USSR and the USA requesting "for direct negotiations" between them, "who represent the two most powerful nations today and in whose hands lies the key to peace or war" The letters were written, as the text stated, 'because of our love of peace and our horror of war and the compelling desire that a way out must be found before mankind is faced with a terrible disaster'

The Belgrade Conference, thus showed beyond any measure of doubt—contrary to what pro imperialist writers had affirmed—that non alignment was neither neutrality in the accepted meaning of the term nor non involvement in the great issues of our modern times Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of the policy of non alignment, made it crystal clear in his address at the Belgrade meet

Non aligned has a negative meaning, but if you give it a positive connotation it means nations which object to this lining up for war purposes military blocs, military alliances and the like Therefore, we keep away from this and we want to throw our weight such as it is, in favour of peace In effect, therefore, when there is a crisis involving the possibility of war, the very fact that we are non aligned should stir us to action should stir us to thought, should stir us to feel that now more than ever it is up to us to do whatever we can to prevent such a calamity coming down upon us The whole course of history of the last few years has shown a growing opinion spread of this conception of non alignment Why is that so? Because it was in tune with the course of events, it was in tune with the thinking of the vast number of people it was in tune with it because they hungered pas

sionately for peace and did not like this massing up of vast armies and nuclear bombs on one side. There is no choice left between our attempt for negotiations for peace or war. If people refuse to negotiate, they must inevitably go to war. There is no choice. I believe firmly that the only possible way is by complete disarmament."

The Belgrade non-aligned Conference, thus, demonstrated the indisputable maturity of the movement, its profound anti-imperialist orientation and great concern for the future of developing countries, for the state of affairs in the entire world, including the situation then obtaining in Europe. It should be stressed here that the Belgrade summit adopted a realistic approach to the objective fact that vast economic resources and military strength was and continues to be concentrated in the USSR and the USA and that the two Great Powers should negotiate on outstanding world issues in order to avoid a nuclear catastrophe. The conclusion Nehru and the entire group of the non-aligned drew at Belgrade was at total variance from what is being dished out by certain imperialist circles and Chinese leaders—namely, that the USSR-USA detente represents a so-called "conspiracy" of "super powers." The call given to the non-aligned by these circles—both imperialist and Maoist—to stay away from this historic international development is, therefore, contrary to the understanding arrived at in Belgrade. The conference had stressed the need for active and all-round co-operation of all states, big or small, in their efforts to achieve peaceful coexistence and avert the threat of world war.

The years following the Belgrade Conference were marked by increasing intrigues on the part of imperialist powers and the Maoists in Asia and Africa. The world witnessed the United States' open intervention in Vietnam, imperialist interference in the affairs of the peoples of Congo (now Zaire), invasion by Chinese troops on India and intensification of anti-communist propaganda in Asia and Africa,

conducted with the motive of disrupting their growing unity with socialist community. However, the non aligned movement overcame the attempts to split it up, grew stronger and forged still more friendly and closer bonds with the socialist countries.

It was in these new conditions that the second—non-aligned conference was held at Cairo in October 1964. This time the number of countries attending it was double of that at the Belgrade meet. Besides, nine Latin American countries, the League of Arab States and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) established in 1963, sent their observers. The sixties was called the Decade of Africa as a large number of the countries of the continent achieved independence during 1961 to 1968. The foreign policies of African states, like those of Asian states, were based on non alignment and anti imperialism. The policy of non alignment in Africa was closely linked with the concept of African unity which had been fragmented by foreign colonial rule in pursuance of its age-old policy of "divide-and rule". The establishment of the OAU made it easier for its members to pursue, under the banner of non alignment, anti imperialist foreign policies. Heads of state and government of 32 independent African states set up, on May 25, 1963, the OAU with the principal aim of eradicating the vestiges of colonialism and racialism on the entire continent. This day is now celebrated as Africa's Liberation Day. Non alignment of African states, on the one hand, severely curtailed the influence of erstwhile colonial powers and on the other, facilitated the establishment of political and economic ties with newly independent and socialist countries. Non alignment is opposed to imperialist attempts at weakening intra African cooperation which constitutes a powerful factor for the national advance of the continent long held under colonial bondage and maintained economically at a dreadfully low level. While accepting the policies of peaceful coexistence, the African countries reject-

ed the idea of living together with racialism and colonialism bolstered, on the international level, by the enemies of African unity, i.e., world imperialist powers

At the Cairo Conference, India welcomed the emergence of Africa on the path of independent development and progress. Even in the days of India's freedom struggle, Jawaharlal Nehru had raised the question of the freedom of the African peoples. He had said about a quarter of a century ago that Africa would emerge one day as a new force on the world scene. How truly that prophecy had been fulfilled Africa which had been kept in bondage for more than a century was on the march. It was determined to fulfil its destiny as its envoys at Cairo proudly proclaimed.

The Cairo Conference missed Jawaharlal Nehru, who had then passed away. Touching tributes were paid to him, to the outstanding role he had played in international affairs, especially as the architect of the policy of non alignment.

The contribution the non aligned countries had made to peoples' struggle against imperialism, colonialism, for peace and international detente were stressed at the conference by President Nasser. Condemnation of Chinese aggression against India was voiced in several speeches. The truculence of China in responding to the Colombo proposals of the non aligned in relation to India's northern borders was touched upon by the Indian Prime Minister. The keynote of speeches made was peace and international cooperation. Naturally, in this world of ours, where distance has shrunk, where interdependence and not exclusiveness is the key to progress and where welfare of each is the concern of all, it was appropriate for the non aligned countries to have laboured together at Cairo—as earlier at Belgrade—to promote, by joint action, the goals of peace and international cooperation.

Representatives from four continents and many countries came to Cairo. They belonged to different cultures

and political systems and spoke different languages. But what united them was their fundamental unity in outlook and approach to the major problems facing the world. It was this identity of outlook that gave to the non aligned, and continues to give it today, a powerful impetus which imperialism and Maoism find difficult to weaken.

The Cairo Conference, in its Programme for Peace and International Cooperation, declared that the forces of imperialism were still powerful and that they do not hesitate to use force to defend their interests and maintain their privileges. It declared the policy of active peaceful coexistence to be an indivisible whole. The Programme stated that the "preservation of peace and promotion of the well being of peoples are a collective responsibility deriving from the natural aspirations of mankind to live in a better world". The conference came out strongly against military blocs and pacts which, it stated, had heightened international tension. It declared that the maintenance of future establishment of foreign military bases against the express wishes of people of those countries constituted a gross violation of the sovereignty of states and a threat to freedom and world peace. It considered indefensible the existence or future establishment of bases in the dependent territories which could be used for the maintenance of colonialism.

In the six years that separated the second and the third non aligned conference, held in Lusaka, capital of Zambia, in September 1970, the imperialists had tried to deliver a series of blows at the liberation movement in Asia and Africa. They had hoped to retard the process of complete liberation of the peoples of both continents from colonial bondage. It was during those years that the US Air Force dropped more bombs on Vietnam than on Nazi Germany in World War II. Similarly, in 1967 the Israeli extremists, in collusion with imperialism, had launched yet another aggression against the Arab states.

The countries of Asia and Africa responded to this fresh outburst of attack supported by Maoists by consolidating their ranks, by searching for new ways of co-ordinating their activity with the socialist community. The USSR, on its part, as a natural ally of the non aligned, redoubled its efforts to ensure peace and security in Europe and Asia and to help bring out, as early as possible, the complete abolition of colonialism.

The Lusaka Conference reaffirmed the determination of the non aligned to persevere in their efforts to achieve peaceful coexistence, disarmament, economic independence and equal cooperation between all states and to continue their struggle against racialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. It was attended by 61 developing countries.

The Conference adopted a Declaration of Peace, Independence, Development, Coexistence and Democratisation of International Relations, which summed up the results of the non alignment policy and expressed all round support to the liberation struggle. It, likewise, stressed the need to bridge gap between the advanced and developing countries—a gap caused by their colonial past. In a special resolution on the Middle East, the Lusaka Conference sharply condemned the continued occupation of Arab lands by Israel. It also expressed its sympathy and support to the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for enjoying the right to independent existence on sovereign territory. The conference passed a resolution on South East Asia in which it condemned US aggression against Cambodia, demanded immediate cessation of imperialist interference in Indo-China and full independence of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

The fourth Conference of the non aligned met in Algiers in September 1973. It attracted an ever larger number of participants. 76 countries and 16 national liberation movements. The conference met at a time when the international

situation had somewhat improved. The imperialist aggression in Vietnam had been halted, armistice had come into effect in Laos, Bangladesh had emerged as an independent state. The Maoists had been further exposed as the arch enemies of the unity and solidarity of the Third World, as standard bearer of imperialism as Peking's ignoble role in relation to the emergence of Bangladesh had shown.

Over the preceding years the anti-imperialist solidarity of the non-aligned had grown immeasurably despite obstacles set up by Peking, their path of independent development had led them to greater success in the economic and military fields and to greater political consolidation internally. The consultative meetings and conferences of their Foreign Ministers, held in the period following the Lusaka Conference, had already paved the way for the adoption of agreed decisions on vital issues. For instance, at a meeting during the 26th UN General Assembly session, the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries had expressed support for the idea, advanced by the USSR, to call a world conference on disarmament. At a special meeting in Georgetown, capital of Guyana, they strongly condemned US aggression in Indo-China, expressed support for the Arab people's just struggle, and demanded an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. They also came out for complete abolition of foreign bases and for making the UN a more effective instrument for safeguarding peace and security throughout the world.

The Algiers meet showed that non-alignment, as conceived by Nehru, was nothing else but the positive assertion of the right of a country to sovereignty, its refusal to be an object of imperialist encroachments. The conference showed that non-alignment had stood the strains of the cold war started by imperialism and had not lost a single grain of

its positive content. This view was expressed forcefully and clearly, by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, from the rostrum of the Algiers Conference.

The increase in the numerical strength of the movement, the high level of representations, the whirl of activities of all delegates confirmed the inherent viability and growing maturity of non alignment. From the Algiers rostrum one heard speeches lauding detente. Practically all speakers referred to peace agreements arrived at in Vietnam and Laos, the discontinuance of bombing of Cambodia, the successful conclusion of the first stage of the conference on European Security and Cooperation etc. They brushed aside dark and gloomy "prophesies" of those who did their best to "prove" that under conditions of world detente non alignment would get suffocated.

The fact that the Algiers meet took place at a time of a definite shift in international situation towards detente, as Indian political observers noted, distinguished it from earlier conferences held at Belgrade, Cairo and Lusaka. Some people—Maoists among them—"theorised" that the altered world situation made the revision of the foundation imperative. As these observers pointed out, the Maoists proposed to reorganise the community of people—united by the desire for peace and national redemption and by determination to put an end to colonialism and neo-colonialism into a kind of "club" of "small and medium sized" countries alienated from all developed socialist powers. The history of non alignment before and after Algiers said a final and emphatic "No" to these "theorists" who were determined to disrupt the unity of the Third World. Half of humanity had declared its adherence to the concept of non alignment. The Soviet Peace Programme, reducing the possibility of a new war, had created favourable objective conditions in which non alignment could achieve greater successes in expanding the zone of peace, in inflicting more telling blows on world imperialism.

and colonialism, in rebuilding the lives of people in Third-World countries which had been condemned to penury and backwardness by the erstwhile foreign rulers. In conditions of international detente the positions of imperialism were further weakened in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the military blocs started showing signs of disintegration. The role of non alignment increased, for it transcended its traditional geographical boundaries and embraced newer regions of the globe. It paid no heed to the disruptive moves of Peking which, by playing upon the "theory" of super powers, wanted to pit the Third World against its natural ally, the Soviet Union. In his speech at Algiers the great revolutionary leader of Cuba, Fidel Castro, refuted strongly the "thesis" of imperialist and Maoist propaganda about a "conspiracy of super powers" and called upon the non aligned states to continue strengthening their economic, political and cultural ties with the USSR and the entire socialist community. He stressed that it was such an alliance that held out the prospects of liquidating colonialism and removing the threat of war. He made a passionate and well reasoned speech asserting the principles of non alignment, of the community of interests of developing countries and socialist community.

The issues of our time were, thus placed in proper perspective at the historic Algiers meeting of the non aligned. In its Political Declaration, the Algiers Conference declared without any equivocation that the "present strengthening of East-West detente and the progress made towards the settlement in Europe of problems inherited from the Second World War represent important achievements by the forces of peace in the world. The fears created by the nuclear threat as well as the determination of the people are increasingly tending to give primacy to dialogue rather than to confrontation."

The Declaration stated that the essential aim of the East West rapprochement, of the negotiations of all kinds currently in progress and of the agreement recently concluded or about

to be concluded, is to establish co-operation within the framework of a system of collective security based on principles which, surmounting ideological differences, aim to regulate international relations. It was within this context that the plan for a European Conference on Security and Cooperation was translated into reality. "The non aligned countries," the Declaration stated, "stress the need for detente initiated between the Great Powers to lead to the effective breaking up of the military alliances stemming from the cold war."

The Algiers Conference declared that the "non aligned countries, which have worked unceasingly to establish peace and eliminate factors of tension through negotiations and recourse to international bodies, welcome all these efforts and initiatives and regard them as a positive step towards the establishment of peace."

The conference noted, at the same time, as Mrs Indira Gandhi has been stressing time and again, that the people are still in direct confrontation with colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid, alien domination and foreign occupation, neo-colonialism, imperialism and zionism. These remain an indisputable reality of our age against which non aligned countries are struggling shoulder-to-shoulder with their brethren of the socialist community. The people want to free themselves from the colonial yoke where it still exists, to eradicate apartheid, zionism, and all forms of racial discrimination and segregation, and to put an end to regimes which are inspired by them and find in them their *raison d'être*.

The Political Declaration evolved at Algiers conference of Heads of Governments and States of non aligned countries declared that they also wanted to establish genuine independence by eliminating foreign monopolies and assuming control over their national resources and exploiting them for the benefit of the people. "The peoples of non aligned coun

tries wish to safeguard their personality, to revive and enrich their cultural heritage, and to promote in all fields their authenticity which has been seriously alienated by colonialism. Lastly, they want to consolidate their independence through effective exercise of their national sovereignty against any hegemony."

The Political Declaration said in ringing words that in "Asia, Africa and Latin America more and more countries are demonstrating their desire for emancipation and their readiness to face up to the trial of force imposed by neo-colonial tutelage and imperialist monopolies." "Accordingly," it added, "non-alignment is continuing to grow in scope and acquires a wider acceptance by expressing, at the international level, the aspirations of an increasing number of states, of the national liberation movements, and of all forces for emancipation and progress throughout the world."

The Algiers meet gave a call to the non aligned countries to continue to work, together with all forces striving for peace and progress, with a view to bringing about a change in international relations towards democracy and equality of all states.

In its Economic Declaration, the Algiers Conference stated that imperialism still remained the greatest obstacle to the emancipation and progress of developing countries which are struggling to achieve levels of living compatible with the most basic standards of well being and human dignity. "Imperialism," the Economic Declaration added, "not only hampers the economic and social progress of the developing countries but also adopts an aggressive attitude towards those who oppose its plans, trying to impose upon them political, social and economic structures which encourage alien domination, dependence and neo-colonialism."

"Colonialism and imperialism," the Economic Declaration stated, "have been unable to withstand the vast political

liberation movement marked by the historic turning point of Bandung but they have adapted themselves in order to perpetuate in other forms their stranglehold on the resources of developing countries and to ensure for themselves all kinds of privileges and guaranteed markets for their manufactured products and services. Policies have been implemented which are based on the use of overt and covert economic aggression as is illustrated by the manifold and increasingly pervasive activities of transnational and monopolistic commercial financial and industrial companies. It is their struggle to achieve independence, economic development and full equality in international relations, the non-aligned countries individually and collectively with the support of all progressive forces in the world, are effectively resisting imperialist aggression and are thus emerging as a major force in the struggle against imperialism throughout the world."

President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nikolai Podgorny and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Alexei Kosygin in a message to the Algiers conference said:

"Your conference has been convened at a time when considerable positive changes filling the hearts of people with hope for the removal of the horrors and calamities of a world war are taking place in the international situation. The process of relaxation, the process of a radical improvement of the world's political climate is steadily developing. The cold war period is giving place to a period of a more stable assertion in international relations of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

"The first significant concrete steps have been taken along the road of curbing the arms race and reducing the threat of a devastating nuclear war. Favourable prospects are opening up for reducing military expenditures and increas-

tries wish to safeguard their personality, to revive and enrich their cultural heritage, and to promote in all fields their authenticity which has been seriously alienated by colonialism. Lastly, they want to consolidate their independence through effective exercise of their national sovereignty against any hegemony "

The Political Declaration said in ringing words that in "Asia, Africa and Latin America more and more countries are demonstrating their desire for emancipation and their readiness to face up to the trial of force imposed by neo-colonial tutelage and imperialist monopolies " "Accordingly," it added, "non alignment is continuing to grow in scope and acquires a wider acceptance by expressing, at the international level, the aspirations of an increasing number of states, of the national liberation movements, and of all forces for emancipation and progress throughout the world "

The Algiers meet gave a call to the non aligned countries to continue to work, together with all forces striving for peace and progress, with a view to bringing about a change in international relations towards democracy and equality of all states

In its Economic Declaration, the Algiers Conference stated that imperialism still remained the greatest obstacle to the emancipation and progress of developing countries which are struggling to achieve levels of living compatible with the most basic standards of well being and human dignity "Imperialism," the Economic Declaration added, "not only hampers the economic and social progress of the developing countries but also adopts an aggressive attitude towards those who oppose its plans, trying to impose upon them political, social and economic structures which encourage alien domination, dependence and neo-colonialism "

"Colonialism and imperialism," the Economic Declaration stated, "have been unable to withstand the vast political

The decisions arrived at the Algiers Conference had a profound impact on the non aligned movement, on the world situation, and on the people's struggle for establishing a new international order based on equality, peaceful coexistence and lasting peace

The conference at Algeria came out as a champion of ideas of unity both within the framework of the non alignment and within the immeasurably wider front of anti imperialist forces. On the battlefields of the 20th century, on the battlefields of our contemporary times, the world of socialism is the objective ally of the Third World. Neither the might of imperialists nor the machinations of Maoism can create a cleavage between these two allied forces of our times

ing, at their expense, allocations for developing the economy, science and culture, for raising the well being of the people, for expanding aid to developing countries. There is every ground to believe that the present relaxation of tension is not a temporary phenomenon but the beginning of a fundamental rebuilding of international relations.

‘Doubtless, the positive processes in the world arena are in the vital interests of all the peoples of the world including the peoples of the non aligned states.

“In the world situation now taking shape the further intensification of efforts by all countries, big and small, aimed at establishing lasting peace on earth, is of paramount importance.

“Your conference, too, can make a weighty contribution to this human and noble cause. All those who hold peace, security and happiness of the peoples dear, all peace-loving forces, must bend their efforts in order that the favourable changes in international life assume an irreversible character and spread through the world.

“The Soviet Union has always come out and is coming out now in support of the peoples struggling to overcome, as soon as possible, the grave legacy of the colonial past or their freedom, independence and progress.

“The USSR will continue its consistent course towards the further development and strengthening of cooperation with the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

“We in the Soviet Union know well and will always remember that together with the peoples of the socialist countries, the peoples of Asian African and Latin American states constitute an important part of the standing army of national liberation progress and peace on the globe. Together we have already done very much, and we are confident that in the future as well our roads will not part.”

Africa and Rhodesia deepening their political isolation. This has spelt greater danger for the "White" minority regimes especially with the unmistakable final victory of the Peoples Republic of Angola over pro-Western puppet groupings the repulsing of South African aggressors and the Security Councils denunciation of the racialists intervention in the internal affairs of Angola. These developments have confirmed the invincibility of the cause of the national liberation movement, the cohesiveness of Afro-Asian countries and the effectiveness of the unity of the Third World with the socialist community. The possibilities open to imperialist powers in Africa are shrinking day by day minute after minute. The tide has turned irrevocably against them.

This phenomenon fuelled by the imperishable spirit of the vast masses has come to constitute a very important milestone in the world people's struggle against imperialism for global peace and for progress of entire mankind. What the end of the era of colonialism has signified for the economic and military strategic positions of imperialism is now known to every student of current affairs. We cannot overlook the enormous significance to world events of the defeat of British imperialism in the Middle East of French imperialism in Indo-China and Algeria and finally of US imperialism in Asia as seen in Vietnam. The positions of imperialism were markedly weakened by the withdrawal of its armed forces from the territories of a large number of Third World countries by the refusal of Afro-Asian states to join Western military pacts and by the liquidation of some of them. The developing countries efforts to dismantle military bases to create nuclear free peace zones in different regions of the world and to ensure collective security have further eroded the military strategic positions of imperialism. The developing countries anti imperialism gathering added momentum after the Algiers summit remains a distinguishing feature of the international

CHAPTER VII

The Fall of Colonialism

The call for ending colonialism given at Bandung and carried forward by the four non aligned summits reverberated, not only in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but all the world over. It was a call propelled forward by the dynamics of history, by the will and determination of hundreds of millions now finding articulation of their innermost longings in these widely represented international forums. It was not fortuitous that the growth of the movement of the non-aligned almost synchronised with the fall of colonial empires. From the close of the fifties decisive blows have been struck at colonialism and the world has been witnessing the emergence of independent states from the prison house of colonialism. These countries, long suffering under foreign rule, took their respective places in the UN, so far denied to them, their flags fluttering atop its building. The colonial empires of imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, built over centuries, fell to pieces in a span of 15 to 20 years. The downfall of the Portuguese empire constituted a decisive phase in the total collapse of the world system of colonialism. It has shattered the "unity" of the enslaved African south. It has also brought about a new alignment of forces, favourable for freedom fighters, weakening the strategic positions of South

Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the principles of international law reaffirm the inalienable right of the colonial countries and peoples to use all the means at their disposal against colonial powers which suppress their aspirations for freedom and independence. The Programme outlines practical measures designed to help carry out the UN's anti colonial resolutions and assist the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples.

The years have also witnessed the UN turning its wrath upon Pretoria's racist regime. In 1974 the South African representative in the UN was deprived in the world body of the right to speak on behalf of the entire population of that country. The movement of protest against the apartheid system in South Africa is growing all over the world. It agitates the people of non aligned countries who are determined to see that an end is put to this monstrosity, that the perpetrators of the crime committed at Sharpeville are brought to book. The movement of non alignment will see to it that an end is put to colonialism in its classical form in its guise of neo-colonialism and in the shape of the crudest combination of colonialism with racialism as in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia. The emergence of Mozambique, Guinea Bissau and Sao Tome and the resounding victory of patriotic forces in Angola are a guarantee that the non aligned countries will fulfil to the last letter the line of action Nehru and Nasser had chalked out. Let it be emphasised again that the non aligned and peace-loving countries have now to turn to the final assault on the citadel of racialism, apartheid and political subjugation in South Africa, as our External Affairs Minister Y B Chavan has said. Victory in this struggle is inevitable and would mark the fulfilment of one of the basic objectives of India's policy of non alignment, he stated.

affairs affecting not only their own lives, but of people the world over. This growing trend on the international arena is a natural consequence of the fact that the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, once objects of history, have now become its subjects. It can, therefore, be confidently stated that the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism has engendered an irreversible process in world politics. The emergence of a large number of independent states, and the evolution of their foreign policy within the framework of non alignment, is of historic importance.

We must not overlook here the contribution the UN Charter made to speed up the process of decolonisation. The Charter included the principle of equality and self determination. The UN adopted its historic Declaration on Granting of Independence of Colonial Countries and Peoples, proclaiming that an end had to be put to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The Declaration solemnly stated that the "subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, contrary to the Charter of the UN and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation." The Declaration was a basic UN decision on the question of the abolition of colonial fascist regimes, a source of powerful moral support to the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples and an international foundation for the growing national liberation movement. Among the UN's main measures taken at uprooting the remnants of colonialism and racialism mention must be made of the Programme of Action for the full implementation of the Declaration (1970), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965) and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of the Apartheid (1973). Among these special mention should be made of the Programme of Action which declares that the further preservation of colonialism is a crime and a violation of the UN Charter. The

people for freedom has evoked international support. The UN Security Council has denounced Rhodesia's actions and called upon all countries to increase assistance to Mozambique.

In this situation, when preparations are afoot to pull down the last "white bastions, hysterical warnings are issued from Pretoria and from Western capitals about the danger of 'Soviet expansionism' and about a 'Cuban invasion' of the African South. These attempts to undermine Africa's unity and to justify the aid given to apartheid regime have failed to detract the African leaders and people from focussing their attention on the objectives they have set themselves. The African peoples' national liberation struggle has evoked frontal hostility from America and full throated support from the USSR. As President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia said in a speech on November 22, 1974, the USSR had always been and continues to be an inspiration for African national liberation movements. Deputy Secretary General of the OAU, Peter Onu, declared that the Soviet policy was meeting the requirements of African liberation movements, that Soviet help was playing a tremendous role and that the African people were sincerely grateful to the USSR.

The representatives of independent Africa and the leaders of African liberation movements, who addressed the Congress, not only highly appreciated Soviet support extended to freedom fighters but also expressed confidence that it would continue till victory over colonialism and racialism was finally won.

The combined Arab solidarity, backed to the hilt by the non aligned and socialist worlds, forced the Israelis to retreat in spite of their much vaunted superiority in weaponry. This blew up the myth spread by the West about the inherent timidity of the Egyptian fallah about the disunity in Arab ranks. The Arab resistance was a classic demonstration of

Sixteen years ago, on March 21, the South African police killed 80 people ruthlessly for taking part in a peaceful demonstration against repressive racialist laws in the town of Sharpeville. Since then March 21 is marked as the International Day for Elimination of Racialism and Racial Discrimination. It is especially observed in India and in other non-aligned countries, which have declared war on colonialism and racialism.

Since that day, Pretoria has suffered one defeat after another. The greatest moral and political defeat was inflicted on it on the battlefields of Angola. Attempts made by South Africa to impose on independent Africa a policy of "relaxation of tension" with racialist regimes and to unite the most conservative African governments under the banner of "anti-communism" have failed.

The non aligned countries cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that the Western powers and the NATO members, which provided money and arms to Portugal to wage its colonial war and to puppet groupings in Angola, continue propping up the apartheid regime with billions of dollars, pound sterling and francs invested in the South African economy. Ignoring the UN embargo, they continue delivering to South Africa tanks, planes, helicopters and warships. Apparently, this prevents Pretoria and Salisbury from seeing the historic doom that awaits them.

Angola has forced South Africa to withdraw its troops from the country. This confirms its determination to help the South West Africa Popular Organisation (SWAPO), which is intensifying its struggle in neighbouring Namibia. The guerillas in Zimbabwe and Rhodesia are expanding their military operations. In reply to Rhodesias provocations, Mozambique closed its border with that country, having applied against it the economic sanctions introduced by the UN. This contribution to the struggle of the Zimbabwe

people for freedom has evoked international support. The UN Security Council has denounced Rhodesia's actions and called upon all countries to increase assistance to Mozambique.

In this situation, when preparations are afoot to pull down the last "white" bastions, hysterical warnings are issued from Pretoria and from Western capitals about the danger of "Soviet expansionism" and about a "Cuban invasion" of the African South. These attempts to undermine Africa's unity and to justify the aid given to apartheid regime have failed to detract the African leaders and people from focussing their attention on the objectives they have set themselves. The African peoples' national liberation struggle has evoked frontal hostility from America and full throated support from the USSR. As President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia said in a speech on November 22, 1974, the USSR had always been and continues to be an inspiration for African national liberation movements. Deputy Secretary General of the OAU, Peter Onu, declared that the Soviet policy was meeting the requirements of African liberation movements, that Soviet help was playing a tremendous role and that the African people were sincerely grateful to the USSR.

The representatives of independent Africa and the leaders of African liberation movements, who addressed the Congress, not only highly appreciated Soviet support extended to freedom fighters but also expressed confidence that it would continue till victory over colonialism and racialism was finally won.

The combined Arab solidarity, backed to the hilt by the non-aligned and socialist worlds, forced the Israelis to retreat in spite of their much vaunted superiority in weaponry. This blew up the myth spread by the West about the inherent timidity of the Egyptian fallah, about the disunity in Arab ranks. The Arab resistance was a classic demonstration of

their determination to liquidate imperialism from the Arab soil. The Soviet support found its classic manifestation, during the peace time, in the construction of the Aswan High Dam and, during the 1973 war, in sending military supplies including missiles which rained death on Israeli aggressive forces

It was sad to learn that President Sadat had chosen to say farewell to the course successfully followed by his great leader Nasser. This course started, stated Al-Mirdyahid of Algeria, when the Egyptian President had opened wide the doors to free enterprise and international capital. Friendship with the USSR, however, is a living reality which cannot be changed, said Baghdad's Tank Al-Shaab. It added that the present Egyptian leadership had departed from President Nasser's policy and taken the side of the most conservative forces in the Arab world.

This course adopted by Egypt recently impedes the achievement of a just Middle East settlement and weakens the efforts of Arab states to achieve the liberation of Arab territories occupied by Israel and to ensure the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. This policy benefits "only the enemies of the Egyptian and other Arab peoples, the forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction."

The progressive and democratic people of the world support the Arab peoples' struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for the full liberation of Israeli-occupied Arab territories, for securing the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, and for establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

India has pledged, time and again its solidarity with the Arab people in their national liberation movement. The spirit of Nehru-Nasser friendship, symbolising the friendship of India and Arab peoples, lives on. The Indian Arab friendship is rooted in tradition, based on common principles and is well taken care of by Mrs. Indira Gandhi personally.

The government headed by her continues to lend support to the Arabs in their aspirations for sovereignty, for return of their lands from Israeli occupation. India has also demanded and continues demanding the restoration of the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine which, as External Affairs Minister Y B Chavan said is at the very core of the conflict. One of the important steps our government took in recognition of this fact was to welcome the PLO to open an office in New Delhi. Mr Chavan added

"We are also of the view that the non aligned movement as a whole should coordinate their efforts to bring to bear upon the powers concerned the strength of international opinion in order to secure a peaceful and just solution of the West Asian question. We believe that in the resolution of this crisis affecting the peace of the world and the security and progress of the West Asian region not only a few great powers but the non aligned countries also have the obligation and capability to play a constructive role.

The UN adopted a resolution on November 10 1975 by an overwhelming majority, branding Zionism as a form of racialism and racial discrimination. By voting for this important document, the General Assembly sternly denounced the aggressive policy of the Israeli ruling circles, who are hampering a comprehensive and fundamental political settlement of the Middle East problem.

The resolution has given rise to a most vociferous campaign on the part of Israel and its supporters in the West. Attempts have been made to explain the condemnation of Zionism by attributing "anti Semitic sentiment". The desire to label the UN resolution as anti Semitic is however, thinly disguised. It is aimed at sticking the tag of anti Semitism to the just condemnation of the Israeli aggression and to the undeviating support socialist and developing countries are lending to Arab peoples liberation struggle. An accusation of anti Semitism is an insult to those countries which voted for the

resolution. Many of them were victims of Hitlerite aggression which was launched with racist and anti-Semitic slogans and against the cause of freedom, democracy, and social progress. In branding Zionism as racialism and racial discrimination the UN only called a spade a spade.

Some people hold that the United Nations ought not to qualify ideologies. However, an ideology mounted on armoured cars and employed as an excuse for capturing thousands of square miles of other people's land and for evicting three million people is in fact aggression. And it is UN's primary duty to prevent aggression, to safeguard peace and security—the cause for which this world body was founded in 1945.

Those who think that what has been going on in the Middle East for nearly three decades is a drawn-out border conflict would do well to read Prof. Ben-Zion Dinur's introduction to the book *The History of Hagana*. It was published by the World Zionist Organisation in conjunction with the Israeli Defence Ministry, and it appeared in the 'Zionist Library' series. The first Israeli Minister of Education used a pogromist jargon in trying to convince the reader that there is room only for Jews in Palestine. 'We shall tell the Arabs to 'move', and if they refuse and resist we shall use force to budge them. We shall beat them, lick them in the back with our feet and make them go'.

The statement dates back to 1954. Israel has since employed, not less than three times, full military support from across the ocean to make the Arabs 'go' and leave land belonging to them by right, to leave the Suez canal, the western bank of the Jordan, and the Golan Heights.

As for the intensity of racial hatred, Zionism appears to have moved farther from other forms of racial discrimination. The American Indians are at least allowed to live in reservations and South African blacks in Bantustans. But the Zionists

are openly seeking to attain a more "ambitious" objective of taking away from the Arabs every inch of land between the Nile and the Euphrates

By identifying Zionism with racialism, the United Nations has thus fulfilled its moral duty towards the oppressed part of humanity

Zionism, like its god father colonialism, is suffering defeat after defeat. If the results of the October 1973 war showed the collapse of the military and political doctrines of Zionism, the UN General Assembly resolution condemning it as a form of racialism and racial discrimination spells a defeat for the Zionist ideology as such. This resolution renders futile the attempts of the leaders of Zionism to conceal the real aims of their movement.

The complete end of the era of colonialism is, thus, approaching. This is an event of decisive importance, not only to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but also to the people of the world at large. It gives world politics a new shape, lifting it out from the old rut in which the diktat of the West was passed on as international law, in which inequality between it and developing countries was taken for granted, and in which the subject peoples of the Orient and Latin America had virtually no role to play in deciding the affairs of the world though they constituted a majority of its population. The end of the era of colonialism has, therefore, heralded a new era in international affairs.

CHAPTER VIII

Towards International Detente

The fundamental restructuring of international relations is a process determined by objective factors which have historically ripened and matured over the years. The non-aligned countries, most of whom have just emerged from the dark tunnel of colonialism into the sunlit valleys of independence, cannot but be deeply interested in this process now taking place. Their contribution to its hastening is undeniable. The vigorous role the newly-independent countries are playing on the international scene has had a tremendous impact on world development. The collapse of colonial empires announced the demise of the old system of international relations. It was at the turn of the sixties that objective conditions ripened for taking a practical approach to the cardinal question of restructuring the entire gamut of international relations. The restructuring is designed at completely excluding from international relations, imperialist wars and violence, threats and diktat, and to create an alternate international system serving as a reliable guarantee for developing peaceful and equitable relations between all nations and people, big and small, Asian and European, developing and developed. Indian people know at their own cost what the system of international relations, engendered in the epoch of triumphant imperialism, was like. It was based on exploitation of the

weak by the strong, on use of force for achieving economic and political ends of "metropolitan" Western countries, on flouting elementary norms of international law. It was the open robbery of the weak by the strong.

Lenin attached tremendous importance to radically altering the structure of international relations of the epoch of imperialism which served its economic, political and military strategic ends.

The emergence of world socialist system and of newly-independent countries has accentuated the crisis of imperialist oriented international relations of the Third World in which hundreds of millions had been denied their role. It also attested to the bankruptcy of the old system, not only in the socio-economic field, but also in the sphere of international relations. With the division of the world into two opposite social systems—the socialist led by the USSR and the capitalist led by the USA—two diametrically opposite systems of relations among states and peoples also took shape. The formation of the world socialist system brought about, consequently, the establishment of a new type of relations among peoples in international spheres.

The change in the balance of forces of two systems and the increasing role played by a large number of Afro-Asian and Latin American countries constitutes a decisive factor in restructuring the system of international relations. The weight of the socialist and non aligned world in the economic, political and military balance of world forces today has been steadily growing, thus seriously reducing the international influence of imperialism.

The foreign policies of the countries of the socialist community and of the non aligned world have a similar or identical approach to several key world issues. This has further isolated imperialism, considerably reduced its capacity to influence world events, and founded it to reckon with this al-

ternate powerful coalition of international forces. The foreign policies of socialist and non aligned blocks have become more effective and the co-ordination of their joint action in solving major world issues closer and more purposeful. The tilt in the balance of world forces in favour of socialism and the triumph of the cause of anti-colonialism have created prerequisites for establishing international relations on truly just and democratic principles.

The developing countries had suffered grievously under the old pattern of international relations which had worked to the advantage of imperialism only. Unhealed are the wounds which we received during imperialist interventions during Western political ventures during wars and aggression. Vietnam suffered the biggest wound the bomb-craters on its soil "dug" by United States colossal but brutal war machine are greater and larger than those created by nature on the Moon. The memory of blackmail and threats of intimidation and bluff is still fresh in our minds. Although the US has had several Presidents and governments Washington's hostile attitude towards the Third World has remained unaltered. We all remember the Truman Administration's actions against developing countries. US intervention in Lebanon in Eisenhower's regime (now once again threatened under Ford Kissinger dispensation) vigorous support extended to Congolese secessionists by President Kennedy's administration and armed intervention against revolutionary Cuba military aggression intensified by President Johnson against Vietnam Laos and Cambodia threats issued by the awesome US-Seventh Fleet to India under orders of President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger. The common denominator of all these acts was to keep the US domination supreme to prevent the rise of alternate centres of regional power detrimental to imperialism's global interests. Melvin Gurtov has described the US objective as follows

" to minimise the influence and presence of the Soviet

Union, to work with US oil companies in maintaining access to oil under 'stable' political conditions and to contain radical nationalism" (*The United States Against the Third World, Anti-Nationalism and Intervention*, New York, 1974, p 260)

It was in pursuance of these nefarious objectives that the US bolstered with its bayonets some of the worst dictatorial, tyrannical regimes of some Asian countries, dragged their peoples into imperialist pacts, keeping them at an abysmally low level of economic development. As the *New York Post* (April 4, 1976) wrote, the US has repeatedly betrayed its commitment to liberty and human rights in areas where "our influence could be most dramatically and directly exerted. It happened in Vietnam. It is happening at this time in South Korea. It is readily visible in our equivocation on the battle for restoration of true freedom in Spain. It states our role in Africa." *The New Republic* (January 26, 1974) wrote in an editorial "The US abets oppression by its aid programme. It demonstrates the dependence of dictatorships on our bounty. The government of the United States is a protagonist in domestic struggles throughout the world. It chooses to help perpetuate the autocracies it sees." The most devastating statement has come from Lincoln P. Bloomfield who accuses the US of having imposed a "protracted and inhuman" war on Vietnam, of having leagued up with the most "unpopular and odious regimes." He writes "We engaged our fortunes with unpopular and sometimes tyrannical regimes in the name of both anti-communism and stability". (*In Search of American Policy. The Human Use of Power*, New York-London Toronto, 1974, p 79)

Bloomfield quotes Dulles having stressed, while issuing instructions as US Secretary of State to the new Ambassador to Costa Rica, that "dictators are the chiefs of state on whom we must depend in Latin America" (p 81)

It cannot be said that this particular role of imperialism has finally come to an end. That would be drawing erroneous conclusion. What is indisputable is the fact that the trend has started towards restructuring of international relations, in which imperialist wars and violence will not find any place, in which open armed interventions are excluded. The defeat of US imperialism in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, the debacle faced by Zionism, the fall of Portuguese colonial empire, the emergence of Angola, the fall of the military regime in Greece, the tottering of the regime in Franco-born Spain, the failure of US economic blockade against Cuba—these are not disjointed events but links in the stupendous world wide process of the emergence of a new correlation of international forces brought about by the weakening of imperialism, end of the era of cold war, triumph of the policy of peace and co-existence over that of war and confrontation.

Experience of world events shows that the process of fundamental restructuring of international relations has become an integral feature of the contemporary reality. The impact the Soviet Peace Programme has had on quickening this process cannot be overlooked. The *Financial Times* for example wrote on April 14 1971, i.e., immediately after the adoption of the Peace Programme by the 24th CPSU Congress "Some of the foreign policy points have already been discounted in certain circles as propagandist and unreal". Events have shown the groundlessness of the charge made.

If we examine the Programme we will readily see how its basic propositions have helped advance the world in the direction of peace and better international climate. As a matter of fact world statesmen are increasingly admitting that the major directions in the development of contemporary world policies were determined by the solution of specific

tasks set forth by the Peace Programme or, what has come to be known, by the "peace offensive" of the USSR launched personally by L I Brezhnev

The Soviet Peace Programme has become the axis of international relations around which goes on a deep confrontation between the forces of peace, progress and democracy, on the one hand, and the forces of aggression and reaction, on the other. The successes achieved in carrying out the Peace Programme were in accord with the objectives set by the non aligned countries in the global theatre as well as in regions plunged into deep crises by imperialism. The cessation of doubt that relaxation of international tension promotes elimination of international conflicts engineered by imperialism to suit its military strategic global interests. In its turn, the elimination of the hotbed of war in South East Asia created additional opportunities for further developing detente.

In Europe the efforts of peace loving forces were also crowned with success. It is a remote continent for US Asians. But we cannot take a detached view of the confrontation which loomed between two opposite camps in Europe from where two world wars had originated. We, non aligned nations, therefore, felt relieved on bearing that this confrontation and cold war had yielded place to cooperation and coexistence as enshrined in the principles embodying the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

The USA USSR agreement on preventing a nuclear missile war and other agreements had a world wide significance in reducing the danger of global holocaust and in creating a better international climate based, not on diktat, but on peaceful co-existence.

The Peace Programme, as we well know, included both short term and long term issues. Some of these have already been solved, others are being solved, and still others are on

the agenda The New Peace Programme requires the fulfilment of the following vital tasks

—While steadily strengthening their unity and expanding their all round cooperation in building a new society, the socialist states must increase their joint active contribution to the consolidation of peace

—Work for the termination of the expanding arms race, which is endangering peace, and for transition to reducing the accumulated stockpiles of arms, to disarmament For this purpose

(a) do everything possible to complete the preparation of a new Soviet US agreement on limiting and reducing strategic armaments, and conclude international treaties on universal and complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, on the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, on banning the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, and also on the banning of the pollution of the natural environment for military or other hostile purposes,

(b) launch new efforts to activate negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe Following agreement on the first concrete steps in this direction, continue to deepen military detente in the region in the subsequent years,

(c) work for a switch over from the present continuous growth of the military expenditure of many states to the practice of their systematic reduction,

(d) take all measures to ensure the earliest possible convocation of the World Disarmament Conference

—Concentrate the efforts of peace loving states on eliminating the remaining seats of war, first and foremost in ensuring a just and durable settlement in the Middle East In

connection with such a settlement the states concerned should examine the question of helping to end the arms race in the Middle East.

—Do everything possible to deepen international detente, to embody it in concrete forms of mutually beneficial cooperation between states. Work vigorously for the full implementation of the Final Act of the European Conference, and for greater peaceful cooperation in Europe.

—Work for Asian Security based on joint efforts by the states of that continent.

—Work for a world treaty on the non use of force in international relations.

—Consider as crucial the international task of completely eliminating all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, encroachments on the equality and independence of peoples, and all seats of colonialism and racialism.

—Work for removing discrimination and all artificial barriers in international trade, and eliminating all manifestations of inequality, dictat and exploitation in international economic relations.

The Third World region has seen what remarkable changes took place over the last five years. On the world map as indicated elsewhere in the book, in place of dark spots of Portuguese colonialism four sovereign African states have emerged. Free Vietnam, free Laos and free Cambodia have opened up new horizons of development in South East Asia. The blockade imposed on Cuba has virtually collapsed. The Palestinian Liberation Organisation is now irrevocably recognised as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people and has gained access to the UN. Finally, Zionism has been condemned as a variant of racist ideology.

The newly independent states are winning ever more frequently in the fight against imperialism thereby unbol-

ding their independence, seeking equality in world economic relations and stepping up the process of development of their peoples

How can one explain the fact that this upsurge has occurred exactly during the last five years? The Third world does not see a mere coincidence in this development. There is a direct relationship between the successes of the process of national liberation and decolonisation and the foreign policies of the socialist and the non aligned countries

The Western circles would like to discover a contradiction between the policy of detente and the solidarity of the USSR with the struggle of peoples for their independence and progress. It is absolutely clear that detente applies to relations between states only, and can by no means be regarded as a break in social and political progress, and even less so in the struggle for national liberation. Angola has well demonstrated the naivete of those who hope that in the conditions of detente the Soviet Union would relax its consistent fight against colonial exploitation and aggression

The USSR's clear 'No' to these delusions is implicit in each line of the new programme of further action for peace and international co-operation for the freedom and independence of peoples. The Third World will hail the call given from Moscow for an end being put to the arms race, for passing over from arms build up to reduction of amassed stock piles and finally, to disarmament. The 800 million undernourished people of developing countries are finding it increasingly hard to put up with the fact that mankind continues to waste away nearly 300 000 million dollars annually for military purposes. This sum is several times more than the official international aid given to the Third World

The USSR's determination to work with redoubled energy for replacing the present process of growth in military expenditures by world powers effecting a systematic reduction

promises to remove from the shoulders of the peoples the burden which is especially heavy for the Third World. The resources siphoned off from economic and social development would come back to the national exchequer. It is sufficient to mention here that the Soviet proposal for 10 per cent cut in the military budgets of five permanent members of the Security Council, if implemented, would make it possible to raise the quantum of assistance to developing countries by at least 20 per cent.

The second generation Peace Programme calls for concentrating the effort of peace-loving states on eliminating the still existing hotbeds of war, above all, in the Middle East, and on leading mankind towards the safeguarding of security throughout Asia by collective means.

There are lies in the New Peace Programme in which one sees a reflection of the liberation battles shaking up Africa today. It proposes that the complete elimination of what is left of the system of colonial oppression, of all the centres of racialism, and of all forms of infringement of national independence, be regarded as one of the major international tasks.

Historical experience shows that the overthrow of colonial regimes is an important, but only a first step towards achievement of independence. At this stage the main content of the national liberation revolutions in the countries which have thrown off direct colonial rule is the struggle for economic independence for sovereignty over their natural resources.

That is why the special attention of the Third World is drawn to the provision in the new Peace Programme which puts forward the task of removing discrimination in international trade and of eliminating all manifestations of inequality and diktat in international economic relations. People of Africa, Asia and Latin America are increasingly coming to the conclusion that these aims are best attainable in

conditions of their full economic cooperation with the socialist world

Today the achievement of economic independence by developing countries can be facilitated by conditions favourable to it. By developing many forms of cooperation with the newly freed countries, socialist states are helping them reach this goal. The socialist states have been rendering them maximum political and moral support on the international scene, reinforcing the struggle of these countries against attempts made by imperialist powers and multinational monopolies to hold on to the levers of economic pressure.

The strengthening of the alliance between the world socialist system and the forces of national liberation that has taken place will exert a tremendous influence on the process of fundamental restructuring of international relations. Their goals and interests in this arena coincide, serving as an objective prerequisite for a further consolidation of their unity which is sure to step up the tempo of this process.

The success achieved in detente should, of course, be regarded as only an important stage in restructuring the system of international relations. One should keep in mind the fact that the period of detente was preceded by a quarter century of cold war and a series of conflicts which more than once threatened to escalate into a world war. If one approaches detente from a broad historical viewpoint, it will become obvious that detente will inevitably gather momentum, embracing new geographical regions and draw into its orbit new states. At the same time, the spectrum of problems on which states belonging to different social systems can find a common approach and mutually acceptable solutions will continue to broaden.

Today one cannot but recall the magnificent role the architect of non-alignment, Jawaharlal Nehru, played in popularising the policies of peace, of abolishing war, of nations

living in harmony on the basis of peaceful co-existence. In his speech at the Belgrade non-aligned conference he had said

‘We must look at things in the proper perspective today. First things must come first and nothing is more important or has priority than this world situation of war and peace. Our capacity is limited but we have a certain capacity, a certain strength, call it what you like, moral strength or other strength. Let us use it properly, rightly, without force but with courtesy and with a friendly approach so that we may influence those who have the power of war and peace in their hands and thus try, if not prevent war for all time, at any rate, to push it away so that in the meantime the world may learn better the use of cooperation. Then the world may ultimately put an end to war itself.’

An inevitable corollary of non alignment, as propounded by Nehru, is non interference in each other's internal affairs. A nation like India which does not belong to any military grouping has no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations nor does it brook their interference in its own affairs. This attitude generates mutual tolerance and, thereafter, leads to accepting of coexistence. When nations coexist it automatically leads to dynamic coexistence, i.e., they take active steps to forge cooperation, first in non political matters like trade, cultural exchange, etc., and then go over to taking measures for blunting and finally removing the sharp edges of their interstate political differences.

The non aligned nations, without exception, are all firm upholders of the policy of peaceful coexistence. They belong to different strands and are a mixture of different blends embodying Latin American culture, Arab and Islamic cultures, Anglo-Saxon strand (as represented by the Caribbean region), Indian civilisation, and the Polynesian and Pacific blends. This grand confluence merges into a broad stream imparting a distinct colour to the international order.

Peaceful coexistence and relaxation of international tension go together. Similarly, the relationship between peaceful coexistence and social progress of mankind are too close to be put in two opposite, mutually hostile compartments.

A host of questions naturally arise. Does detente influence social progress, if it helps the latter, then how substantially? And, on the other hand, another question arises: does social progress influence detente, if so, in what direction, if it promotes the latter, then how effectively? These and many other questions are asked and answered throughout the world by political leaders and scholars, by press and television commentators. The answers, naturally, differ depending on one's political views and persuasions.

The enemies of detente are seeking to confuse the issue and to frighten the people. The right wing extremists assert that the lessening of international tension is advantageous to the socialist countries alone and constitutes a manoeuvre, a "new cunning invention of the Communists" designed to lull the vigilance of the "free world" and to launch "subversive" activities against it. Those on the extreme "left", in turn, assure us that relaxation is advantageous only to capitalism and is an abandonment of revolutionary aims. Between these two poles there are many other interpretations which avoid extreme points of view, but often do not become any more correct by doing so.

The problem of the relationship between detente and social progress is nothing but the presentation, in a unique contemporary form, of the cardinal question of the relationship between progress and peace. The USSR, a strong advocate of coexistence, does not advocate the spreading of revolution by arms because war brings great misfortunes to the working masses and because social progress is an objective process which cannot be imposed from outside and must grow out of the internal conditions of each country. The

USSR is against the export of revolution as well as counter-revolution. So the only reasonable principle of international relations in the transitional epoch, when socialist and capitalist states co-exist in the world, is the principle of peaceful co-existence.

In the very first days of its life the land of the Soviets proclaimed the policy of peace and followed it unswervingly. So it was when socialism was weak, and so it is now when socialism has become immeasurably stronger and turned into a world system and is exerting an ever more decisive influence on the course of world developments.

How does international tension or its relaxation influence internal development? Answering this question, one should bear in mind the fundamental qualitative differences between the two social systems.

It is understandable that detente opens up the possibility of a wider and fuller operation of the objective laws of the socialist system—concentration of social production, first and foremost, on the tasks of peaceful constructive efforts, satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of people, further development of their labour and political activity and of socialist democracy, etc.

As regards capitalism, international tension means the possibility of imperialist reaction, on the pretext of an external "communist" threat, to give the militarists a free hand, to more openly and mercilessly crush the democratic movement, to introduce special laws to give short shrift to "subversive" elements, and to trample upon elementary democratic rights. But this is not all. Whereas they proclaim themselves to be the only steadfast defenders of national interests and claim that all left elements are secret accomplices of "foreign aggressors", and while they speculate on patriotic sentiments, the conservative parties use international tension as a lever to exert pressure on the mass of voters in an

effort to artificially change the balance of political forces in their favour. That is why the easing, and, still more, the removal of tension on the world scene knocks out of the bands of reaction the wrench for the "tightening of screws" and the deception of the working people. Peaceful co-existence, as it were, fixes socio-economic aspects of capitalism within the narrow framework of its natural laws, when its contradictions are fully revealed.

Lastly, international tension serves as a camouflage for the employment by imperialism of the crudest, the most violent methods of suppression of the national liberation movement. All colonial wars and acts of imperialist aggression in the last decades were justified on the pretext of the need to protect the "distant frontiers of freedom", to counter the "penetration of communism", etc. Detente considerably expands the possibility of the forces of national and social emancipation to stand up to imperialist pressure, and to use their growing political potential for working for the establishment of equitable conditions in trade exchange and for the adoption of other measures for closing the existing gap in economic development.

In this way, the reduction of international tension makes a favourable impact on social progress in all basic sectors of the contemporary world. It is common knowledge that the process of detente did not begin today or yesterday. It is correctly linked with the Peace Programme set forth at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, with the joint policy of the countries of the socialist community, the non-aligned block supported by all progressive and peace-loving forces, it is this Programme that has brought about many of the fruitful results achieved in recent years. In other words, detente already has definite accomplishments to its credit, and it is possible now, not speculatively, but on the basis of facts, to judge the degree of its influence on the development of social processes.

The positive influence of detente on the development of progressive social processes is undeniable. Equally unquestionable is the influence of social progress on detente. It is expressed in the fact that the countries where the socialist revolution has been victorious come out as the initiators of the drive for detente. The march of the national liberation movements and their fresh successes signify, at the same time, the expansion of the front of the peace supporters, because the socialist-oriented states and the participants in the movement of the non aligned are deeply interested in the assertion of the principles of peaceful co-existence, and support in practice the efforts of the socialist countries and other peace-loving forces in this direction.

The reduction of international tension does not at all lead automatically to social progress. It merely creates preconditions for the free development of the struggle of the people.

Nobody can give guarantees to imperialism about the preservation of its domination. No power on earth is capable of reversing the inexorable process of the renovation of social life. Wherever there is colonialism, there is bound to be struggle for national liberation. Wherever there is exploitation, there is bound to be struggle for the emancipation of labour. Wherever there is aggression, there is bound to be resistance to it.

It should be pointed out that sober admission of the fact that peaceful co-existence does not, nor can mean the preservation of the social status quo appear from time to time in the Western press. At the same time, the majority of imperialist ideologists are very reluctant and unwilling to take into account the present alignment of forces in the international arena. They are feverishly seeking a substitute for the notorious concept of a "communist threat", so as to continue to "justify" the imperialist policy which contradicts

the spirit of detente. It is as a result of such a "search" that a thesis has appeared to the effect that the socialist countries have to pay for detente by renouncing some of the principles of the political system of socialism.

Detente conforms to the objective needs of contemporary international reality and is determined by deep going processes. It would be erroneous to imagine, however, that detente is a self propelling process, not requiring a push from behind. Detente constitutes a very complicated international phenomenon, reflecting the diversity and contradictions of international reality itself. A specific feature of the current world affairs is that two opposite processes are under way simultaneously. On the one hand, detente, reflecting the chief trend of present day international life, is gaining fresh strength. On the other, are the rapid reactionary imperialist circles building up resistance to positive dangers in the world situation. It is the confrontation between these trends that determines the entire complex of international relations today.

Some Western circles have spun a spurious "theory"—highly inimical to the interest of Afro-Asian nations—that as the threat of global war recedes, local wars and conflicts become more possible and almost inevitable. The conclusion they draw is inescapable: the less the danger of global war, the more the danger of a local war. Local conflict, in the context of current world reality, cannot be compartmentalised and seen in isolation from the overall world situation. If geographically and militarily they are considered local wars, politically they are not. The war in Vietnam was not just a localised war but one whose impact transcended the frontiers of the region where it was imposed by imperialism.

It must be stressed here that restructuring of international relations, facilitated by the acceptance of peaceful co-existence by Western powers, by detente, cannot be ensured

without ending the arms race for it is imperialism which creates the material base for war and, therefore, for stock piling of armaments. Disarmament is the need of the hour, the great imperative of our times. As Nehru told the Belgrade summit "essentially we can never succeed unless there is disarmament on the biggest scale. Therefore, disarmament is a vital matter."

Lastly, the system of international relations which is taking shape today, cannot be viable if economic inequalities between great and small countries, between imperialist and Third World countries are retained as part of the world political system. The non-aligned countries consider it their major task to ensure that inequality in international economic relations are removed as a source of exploitation and thus the structure of the altered world is made stable. These countries cannot ignore the peril posed by imperialism to utilise economic pressure as a stick to beat them with and ultimately, to coerce them into an alignment with its global course. This policy is regarded as more advantageous in comparison with the traditional methods. As Prof J S Nye wrote

"Economic sources of power which are easier to apply gradually and increasingly than threats of force and which are less offensive to national prestige and dignity are often the hardest means of dealing with other states' policies that impose significant costs on one's own state" (International Affairs, London, 1974, p. 586)

Economic pressure is, consequently, resisted by non-aligned countries as a dangerous weapon for binding them with imperialist systems of exploitation and for retarding their march towards self-reliance.

CHAPTER IX

Economic Independence and Cooperation Among Nations

The objectives of non alignment were defined in the course of its steady evolution. The general propositions were laid down at the inception of the movement itself. Those were largely rooted in the past colonial experience of the nations. These propositions, valid even to this day, were opposition to colonialism and racialism, urge for peace and disarmament, support to UN, etc. The total impact of non alignment, whatever the stage of its evolution, has been towards contributing to the stability and maintenance of peace in the world, to preserving national independence, to maintaining political stability and to advancing the national interests of these countries.

The prime problem of all developing countries, forming the core of the non aligned world, has been the modernisation of their traditional or medieval societies as rapidly as possible. There is a relationship between the momentum of this social revolution within a country and non alignment as shown by India and its foreign policy. Governments which pursue non alignment in their external relations are precisely those which are conscious of the task of social revolution and are most responsive to the demands of their

communities. The fact of their under-development along with the conscious urge for this social revolution, continue to act as a bond of mutual sympathy, understanding and unity among these nations. Whereas the first summit evolved the framework of non alignment, defining its historical role in relation to world problems of war and peace, the subsequent ones have lent it depth and dimension.

A running thread of these summits has been to rally the non aligned for concerted measures to bring about closer economic relations among developing countries to cultivate the spirit of self reliance, to secure optimal utilisation of natural resources in their territories for the welfare of their peoples. It was at the Lusaka meeting of Foreign Ministers of non aligned countries in August 1975, representing 83 nations, that this aspect of non alignment received a closer attention. Its strong economic overtones marked it from earlier meets, thus predetermining the character of the forthcoming Colombo Conference of the Heads of State and Government of Non Aligned Countries. The Lima declaration sought to strengthen the unity and solidarity of non aligned states in their search for a new economic order involving naturally, the finding of solution to problems which affect these states in the fields of trade, transfer of resources etc. Secondly, as the Lima meet underscored, co-operation among developing countries constitutes an integral part of international economic co-operation.

Of momentous significance to the non aligned for evolving a new international economic order, free from discrimination in trade, exploitation of resources, etc., was the 6th Special UN General Assembly session of the UN held in 1974 on problems of raw material resources and economic development. This was the first UN session convened in its history to consider a wide range of questions linked with international economic relations which had been exacerbated lately in the non socialist world. The heads of state, foreign

ministers and other leading statesmen of about 100 countries took part in the general discussion at the Special Session. Most speakers emphasised that the present discriminatory economic and trade relations existing in the world must be ended and that the time had come to replace them by relations of equality and co-operation.

The sponsors of the session naturally were non aligned countries. They evaluated the significance of the new positive tendencies in international relations marked by detente by departure from cold war and by normalisation of relations between great powers. These tendencies as they noted must be further developed and extended. The Third World they added must play an important role in discussing and solving the fundamental international issues. They all stressed the need to abandon the present system of relations which makes it possible for "an economically developed minority" to capture raw material markets to perpetuate the system of plunder and to pump out the resources of the Third World. They proposed a new system which would equally consider the interests of all countries. The developed countries they stressed from the UN roster must unite in order to uphold their demands.

The demands of developing countries were summed up by the Group of 77 in the shape of a draft Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and a draft Programme of Action. The documents worked out by the Special Session on the basis of these drafts stress that the present order directly runs counter to the latest positive tendencies in international political and economic relations and further widens the gap between developed and developing countries. The remnants of colonialism and foreign domination, racial discrimination, apartheid and neo-colonialism in all its manifestations remain the documents state. These are the main obstacles to the full liberation and progress of developing countries.

The new international economic order, as pointed out by the Declaration adopted by the session, must be based on the full observance of principles like sovereign equality of states, territorial integrity, right of people to self determination, principle of inadmissibility of seizure of foreign territory by force, and also non intervention in the internal affairs of states. It is necessary to recognise the right of every state to establish the economic and social system which it considers suits best its own economic development, the right of every country to exercise inalienable sovereignty over its natural resources and over the entire range of internal economic development. This includes the right of nationalisation, to indemnity and full compensation for exploitation and depletion of natural and raw material resources or for damages inflicted. It also includes full compensation for exploitation and selfish utilisation of manpower and resources of these states, their territories and peoples.

The document recognises the right of control by developing countries over the functioning of international corporations, the right to set up an equitable correlation between prices of raw material products, finished goods and semi manufactured goods exported by developing countries and prices of manufactured goods, means of production and equipment imported by Third World countries and the right to set up and strengthen the producers' associations dealing with the main raw material products.

The Programme of Action outlines concrete measures designed to facilitate the independent economic progress of developing countries.

The socialist states supported the stand taken by developing states and also the drafts of resolutions submitted by them and made specific suggestions about improving their content.

The USA, Britain, the FRG and other economically deve-

developed Western powers found themselves in a difficult position at the Special Session. Admitting the full gravity of the present economic situation in the world, these countries, at the same time, tried to absolve themselves of responsibility for it. They attempted to absolve themselves of the just accusations of developing states and to intimidate these countries with the threat of facing consequences to which the adoption of the resolution would lead. They offered proposals aimed at preserving the dominance of foreign monopolies in the Third World.

Typical was the speech of US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger who, in effect, challenged the legitimacy of unity of developing countries aimed at controlling the world prices of the raw materials they produce. The establishment of "such cartels", he said, would only lead to the establishment of a bloc of countries consuming raw materials, that is, to the further deepening of contradiction between the developed countries of the West and developing countries. He did not refer at all to the sovereign rights of developing countries over their resources. Other important demands were also ignored.

As expected, China's contribution was conspicuous by absence of advancing constructive proposals. The Peking representative, on the contrary, used all the talent he had to attempt to discredit the name of the USSR in order to undermine its growing economic co-operation with developing countries. He hardly mentioned who the real plunderers of Third World countries were. No accusing finger was pointed by him towards the US monopolies and trans national corporations and he practically excluded from the list of exploiters the monopolies of Western Europe and Japan.

The USSR and other socialist countries took a clear-cut, constructive and principled position on problems of raw materials and economic development. The USSR Foreign

Minister, Andrei Gromyko, stated the Soviet position clearly, without any equivocation. The USSR has been sympathetic to the efforts made by developing countries to eliminate, as swiftly as possible, the heritage of their past and sharply to accelerate economic growth rates. To this day many developing countries remain objects of exploitation by foreign monopoly capital. They occupy subordinate positions in the system of international capitalist division of labour. Foreign monopolies and multinational corporations, as before, maintain control over key sectors of economy in the Third World. Foreign—above all, multinational corporations—control more than half of world trade in raw materials as has been pointed out by a study conducted by a group of UN experts Secretariat, *Multinational Corporations in World Development* (1973). During 1971, according to this study, the volume of direct foreign capital investments by US multinational corporations alone amounted to 4,800 million dollars while their profits (in the shape of dividends, interest, payment for licenses, patents and managerial service) reached a sum nearly twice as high—9,000 million dollars. It is these multinational corporations which played a sinister role in creating the energy crisis in the Western World.

The economic positions of Third-World countries have worsened not merely because profits are drained out by the "metropolitan" countries. Non-equivalent exchange is operating in full force, prices of raw materials and manufactured goods fluctuate, monetary and financial crises rage with full fury.

It is necessary to eliminate from this system the survivals of colonialism and neo-colonialism and all forms of inequality and discrimination. This is vital for accelerating the process of industrialisation of developing countries. In 1965-1970 period the growth of industrial rate of production in developing countries, which had eliminated colonialism and launched upon industrialisation, averaged 6.2 per cent

whereas in 1972 it had reached 8.2 per cent. The construction of core industries, like power engineering, metallurgy, heavy engineering, petro-chemicals, etc., is being speeded up in many countries with public sector commanding the economic heights as in India. This had resulted in invisible structural changes in their economy. For instance, one third of the GNP now comes from industry and only one fifth from agriculture.

However, this represents only a trend, not the entire reality, of the economic life inside Third World countries. As is noted in documents drafted by UN and ILO experts, in no developing state has industrial development reached a scale comparable to a developed state. The developing countries have 70 per cent of world's population but they account for only seven per cent of the world's gross industrial product. Industrialisation of developing countries is impeded largely, apart from internal conservative elements in the economy, by the instability of world capitalist economy. As the Peruvian newspaper *Expreso* (March 9 1975) said, the industrialised capitalist states "have shifted the burden of economic crisis" to these countries.

Moreover, as is stated in a document drawn up by the Group-77, "foreign and colonial rule, foreign occupation all forms of foreign aggression racial discrimination apartheid, imperialism and neo-colonialism in all its forms constitute to be among the greatest obstacles to the emancipation and progress of developing countries and their peoples."

The developing countries therefore, reject the need for industrial development that is linked with foreign interests. They reject industrial development based on the mercenary activities of big multinational corporations which constitute a new type of imperialist penetration. Genuine independent economic development presupposes due attention being paid to maintaining economic relations with all countries on the

legitimate and just conditions of equality and respect for all countries

The Third World demonstrated its fundamental unity in February 1976 at Manila where the ministerial-level meeting of Group of 77 (now grown to 110) was held. The Manila Declaration reaffirmed the urgency for a new economic order which alone could enable the developing countries to fortify their political independence with economic independence and self-reliance. The new economic order is to be based "on justice and equality which will eliminate the inequitable economic structures imposed on developing countries, principally through the exploitation and marketing of their natural resources and wealth." The Manila Declaration, as the *Economic Times* (February 8, 1976) wrote, condemned and rejected "all forms of discrimination, threats and coercive economic policies, either direct or indirect, against individual or groups of developing countries."

On the eve of the Manila meeting of the emerging countries, US Secretary of State Kissinger issued a threat to them in a language that was intimidatory in tone and derogatory to the self-respect of hundreds of millions inhabiting these vast stretches of the globe. On January 30, 1976, he told the US Senate Finance Committee

"I have asked each of our embassies overseas to make clear to its host governments that one of the factors by which we will measure the value which that government attaches to its relations with us will be its statements and votes on that fairly limited number of issues which we indicate are of importance to us in international forums."

Political leaders in India rightly took this statement to mean that Kissinger had warned the Third World countries "to behave" and vote in the UN and at other world bodies to suit US interests, if, as the US Secretary of State chose to state, they want "preferential trade treatment."

whereas in 1972 it had reached 8.2 per cent. The construction of core industries, like power engineering, metallurgy, heavy engineering, petro-chemicals, etc., is being speeded up in many countries with public sector commanding the economic heights as in India. This had resulted in invisible structural changes in their economy. For instance, one third of the GNP now comes from industry and only one fifth from agriculture.

However, this represents only a trend, not the entire reality, of the economic life inside Third World countries. As is noted in documents drafted by UN and ILO experts, in no developing state has industrial development reached a scale comparable to a developed state. The developing countries have 70 per cent of world's population but they account for only seven per cent of the world's gross industrial product. Industrialisation of developing countries is impeded largely, apart from internal conservative elements in the economy, by the instability of world capitalist economy. As the Peruvian newspaper *Expreso* (March 9, 1975) said the industrialised capitalist states "have shifted the burden of economic crisis" to these countries.

Moreover, as is stated in a document drawn up by the Group-77, "foreign and colonial rule, foreign occupation, all forms of foreign aggression, racial discrimination, apartheid, imperialism and neo-colonialism in all its forms constitute to be among the greatest obstacles to the emancipation and progress of developing countries and their peoples."

The developing countries, therefore, reject the need for industrial development that is linked with foreign interests. They reject industrial development based on the mercenary activities of big multinational corporations which constitute a new type of imperialist penetration. Genuine independent economic development presupposes due attention being paid to maintaining economic relations with all countries on the

legitimate and just conditions of equality and respect for all countries

The Third World demonstrated its fundamental unity in February 1976 at Manila where the ministerial-level meeting of Group of 77 (now grown to 110) was held. The Manila Declaration reaffirmed the urgency for a new economic order which alone could enable the developing countries to fortify their political independence with economic independence and self-reliance. The new economic order is to be based "on justice and equality which will eliminate the inequitable economic structures imposed on developing countries, principally through the exploitation and marketing of their natural resources and wealth". The Manila Declaration, as the *Economic Times* (February 8, 1976) wrote, condemned and rejected "all forms of discrimination, threats and coercive economic policies, either direct or indirect, against individual or groups of developing countries".

On the eve of the Manila meeting of the emerging countries, US Secretary of State Kissinger issued a threat to them in a language that was intimidatory in tone and derogatory to the self respect of hundreds of millions inhabiting these vast stretches of the globe. On January 30, 1976, he told the US Senate Finance Committee

"I have asked each of our embassies overseas to make clear to its host governments that one of the factors by which we will measure the value which that government attaches to its relations with us will be its statements and votes on that fairly limited number of issues which we indicate are of importance to us in international forums."

Political leaders in India rightly took this statement to mean that Kissinger had warned the Third World countries 'to behave' and vote in the UN and at other world bodies to suit US interests, if, as the US Secretary of State chose to state, they want "preferential trade treatment".

The people of the Third World countries have treated such outbursts of Kissinger with all the contempt he deserves. In their minds he has come to be identified with all the dirt Washington churns out, day in and day out, in its world machine built to intimidate the emerging nations. Despite the setbacks US foreign policies suffer, fresh blood keeps on being pumped into the Foreign Secretary's sagging sinews by the multi nationals which he represents faithfully and whom he serves loyally. The Third World countries will never forget how Prime Minister Indira Gandhi defined the role of these multi nationals in her stirring address to the plenary session of the Algiers non aligned summit.

"As the economic struggle becomes more acute, the long-suppressed voices of people sharpen, but with every step forward the resistance of entrenched groups often aligned with foreign interests, especially the faceless multi national corporations, becomes more vehement, unscrupulous, and, at the same time, more subtle and invidious, for it is no longer overt but indirectly subversive and provocative. In India we see these constraints in operation every day."

A predominant tendency in many developing countries is, therefore, growing in the direction of introducing legislation for restricting the influence of multi national corporations and for establishing control over them. This is prompted by the serious concern of young states at the increasing economic and political influence of the corporations in the internal affairs of these countries.

The developing countries and multi nationals virtually occupy diametrically opposite stands. The recent Second Session of the Inter Governmental Commission of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in Lima eloquently showed this. The majority of delegations from developing countries stressed the need to take effective measures for restricting the activities of multi nationals. The representatives

of Peru, Algeria, Argentina, Mexico and many other countries came out for strengthening the united anti imperialist front which is essential for successfully opposing the policy of multi national corporations

The Western representatives, on the other hand, tried to justify the rapacious nature of multi nationals and embellish their activities in all developing countries

Delegates from socialist countries took a principled position at the session. The Soviet delegation stressed that the activity of multi nationals, which frequently interfere in the political and economic affairs of developing countries, posed a direct threat to their national sovereignty. The Soviet delegation supported the stand of developing countries which insisted that the elaboration of a code of behaviour for multi national corporations should be considered a task of prime importance. A similar position was taken by the representatives of other socialist states

A remarkable feature of the Second Session of the ECOSOC was its anti imperialist direction. The representatives of developing countries insisted on working out an international agreement which would ban any interference by multi national corporations in their political life, whereas the representatives of Western states sought to retain the conditions for the uncontrolled activities of multi nationals. As the head of the Peruvian delegation, Eduardo Valdes, said in a press interview "The work of the Second ECOSOC session can be positively evaluated. The very fact that the question of curbing multi nationals was openly discussed is of immense importance for developing states." "We note with great satisfaction," he said, "that in the course of the discussion the Soviet Union and other countries backed developing nations. In turn the developing countries demonstrated their readiness and determination to combine their efforts with the moves made by the socialist states."

The fourth session of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) held in Nairobi brought out sharply, as the Soviet Minister of Trade Nikolai Patolichev states, the existence of not only two opposite socio-economic systems in the world but of "two diametrically opposite approaches to establishing relations with developing countries"

The Soviet Minister stated in his speech at the conference

"We are sure that in present-day conditions the newly-free countries can perfectly oppose the imperialist diktat and seek just, i.e., equal economic relations. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries do not divorce their support of the developing states' struggle for speeding up their progress from the struggle for the further deepening of detente, for peace and security."

The head of the Soviet delegation supported the resolve of Asian, African and Latin American countries to shake off imperialist exploitation and to dispose of their national wealth

N S Patolichev pointed to the USSR's preparedness to co-operate for radically reshaping the world raw material market structure, for creating favourable conditions for the developing countries to boost the export of industrial goods of their own and in forming their own technological potential

Dwelling on Peking representative's attacks on socialist countries and on detente, the head of the Soviet delegation expressed his firm conviction that the problems facing the UNCTAD could be solved only in an atmosphere of businesslike discussion, free from sheer demagoguery. The malicious attacks made by the representative of China, claiming a special role in the world and acting as the herald of a new world war, against the policy of detente, against the strengthening of peace and security, he said, hardly need to be commented upon. The slanderous concoctions of the representatives of this power against the socialist countries,

N S Patolichev pointed out, are aimed at undermining the cooperation between socialist and developing states, at undermining the solidarity of the forces coming out for the abolition of the old economic order and, therefore, run counter to the interests of the developing countries, to the interests of struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Speaking at the conference, India's Minister for Commerce, Shri D P Chattopadhyaya, said that the widening of commercial and economic relations with the socialist community of states is the most important prerequisite for strengthening the positions of developing countries in international trade

'We regard foreign economic relations to be an effective means facilitating the carrying out of political and economic tasks. The might and cohesion of the community of socialist countries have been growing stronger through economic integration. Cooperation with the developing states is facilitating the restructuring of their economy and social life on progressive principles.'

Earlier in the Report he stated

'It is quite clear now that with the present correlation of class forces in the world, the liberated countries are quite capable of resisting imperialist diktat and achieving just—that is, equal—economic relations.'

CHAPTER X

Indian Ocean As A Zone of Peace

Even the enemies of non alignment will not deny that non alignment has become indivisible from peace. Nothing is more abhorrent to non alignment than military pacts and bases which while serving the global and regional objectives of imperialism prepare the soil for war. Besides these bases are sought to be used as springboards of attack against the awakened Afro-Asian countries. This is especially true of the Indian Ocean which washes the shores of 20 such independent states not counting several islands and clusters of islands which are still dependencies of Western powers. As the Cairo Conference of non aligned countries declared

The conference condemns the expressed intention of imperialist powers to establish bases in the Indian Ocean as a calculated attempt to intimidate the emerging countries of Africa and Asia and an unwarranted extension of the policy of neo-colonialism and imperialism.

The Cairo declaration assumed greater urgency and added importance after the US Government's decision became known that it was fast turning the Diego Garcia communication centre in the Indian Ocean into a full fledged nuclear military base. External Affairs Minister Mr. Y. B. Chavan informed the Lok Sabha on March 18, 1976 that the Diego Garcia base which was being developed as a full fledged US naval base might also have nuclear facilities.

Diego Garcia, a tiny island in the Indian Ocean, in the Chagos Archipelago about 1,700 kms southwest of the Indian sub-continent, has figured prominently in the world press

Aggressive imperialist circles are planning to use this islet, a mere 27 sq km in area, for setting up a major military base. As far back as 1966, the USA and Britain signed an agreement to build military installations on the Chagos Archipelago and also on the three islands of Aldabra, Farquhar and Des Roches, all British colonial possessions in the Indian Ocean. Finally, Washington and London announced that only Diego Garcia would have a US naval communications station. In the spring of 1973 the station went into operation.

The Pentagon got the British government to agree to a significant expansion of Diego Garcia installations, making the island a major military outpost in the Indian Ocean. There are plans afoot for extending the landing strip on Diego Garcia, deepening the harbour, and building port facilities to take US warships including Polaris submarines.

The establishment of this new military bridgehead in the Indian Ocean is a key element in the far reaching designs of West's top brass. As the *Washington Post* (January 30, 1974) noted, a US base on Diego Garcia would make it far easier for the United States to assert itself throughout the entire area.

The militarists in the USA and some other Western states have long sought to entrench their "presence" here. The dispatch of special American naval squadrons to the Bay of Bengal in December 1971 (at the height of the struggle for liberation in Bangladesh) and to the Strait of Bah el Mandeb in October 1973 (when hostilities flared up in the Middle East) showed conclusively enough how dangerous return to positions-of-strength policies are. A task force of US warships from the 7th fleet keeps on plying the waters of the Indian Ocean at the present time.

Uptill now the naval base in Bahrain has been the Pentagon's stronghold in the Indian Ocean. But, judging from foreign press reports the US will soon have to leave it, since the Bahrain Government has decided to suspend the lease.

Britain has a naval base at Simonstown in South Africa. From this strategic vantage point it controls entry into the Indian Ocean from the Atlantic.

In the eastern sector of the Indian Ocean there is a large combined US and British naval base at Cockburn Sound on Australia's south western coast. Finally, the British base at Singapore controls the key passage into the Indian Ocean from the Pacific. Under the 1971 agreement between Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia and Singapore, Britain maintains in this area six frigates or destroyers, a unit of long range aircraft, some helicopters and airborne and ground forces.

The imperialist military presence in the Indian Ocean also relies heavily on US bases in the Pacific. Important strongholds oriented also towards the Indian Ocean are the bases at Sattahip in Thailand and at Subic Bay in the Philippines. Besides there is the base on Guam from where submarines enter the Indian Ocean.

Nevertheless the Indian Ocean still forms a gap between the bulk of US and British armed forces permanently deployed on the one side in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and in the Pacific on the other. Needless to say it could quickly become the connecting link in this entire pattern of naval strategy if the plans for a large base at Diego Garcia are pushed ahead.

The moves taken to enlarge the Diego Garcia bridgehead indicate that the US intends to impart a broader and more permanent character to its presence in the Indian Ocean. Moreover, the possibility cannot be ruled out that after Diego Garcia the other British islands listed in the aforementioned 1966 agreement will also be developed.

The establishment of such island bases is linked with the Pentagon's "grand ocean strategy" In 1971 the Washington Post military correspondent said that regarding the US military machine to the Guam Doctrine was likely to turn the Navy into the dominant arm of the service before the close of the present decade Small wonder the US Navy is already getting a bigger share of budget appropriations than any other arm of the service

It is clear that these designs square up with other plans harboured by the more zealous cold war warriors It is symptomatic, for instance, that the North Atlantic Assembly, a gathering of parliamentarians from NATO countries, called in 1972 for permanent Western naval presence in the Indian Ocean

The colonialist racialist regimes in southern Africa are anxious to implement their *adventuristic designs* The Malagasy paper *Hita Si Re* says they are trying to get the plans for knocking together one more—a South Atlantic—bloc off the ground

Public opinion in littoral as well as in hinterland states has, therefore, been inflamed by Pentagon's incendiary measures of turning Diego Garcia into a nuclear military base in the Indian Ocean The storm of protests lashed the shores of countries far beyond the waters of the Indian Ocean whose age old tranquillity is sought to be disturbed by US imperialism An idea of this indignation was revealed by the former US Ambassador in New Delhi Chester Bowles who said in an article in the *New York Times* "Whatever America's rationalisation, Diego Garcia has come to symbolise the most recent example of needless American interference in Asia"

It shocked the Afro Asian opinion to learn that the US Government had received behind-the-scene encouragement from Peking to 'go ahead' with its plans in the Indian Ocean As the *Newsweek* revealed, in adopting the decision to create a large military base in the Indian Ocean, "Washing

ton secured tacit approval from Peking" China's motives in seeing that the US continues its presence in the region is two-fold. First, it is motivated by morbid anti-Sovietism which is the principal orientation of Peking's foreign policy. The *Time* (March 29, 1976) wrote after former president Nixon's visit to China that the report he sent to Ford and Kissinger "indicated that Mao's motive in extending the invitation was to signal Peking's overriding concern that the US remain a strong counter weight to Soviet power in Asia." Secondly, China pursues its own great power ambition in the Zone which, in the prevailing world situation, it can achieve only if US presence is not eliminated. The *Daily Telegraph* (July 4, 1973) wrote of India's anxiety over the "growing Chinese naval presence in the Indian Ocean." The paper emphasised that the "Chinese plan to fire an intercontinental ballistic missile across the Indian sub-continent into the Indian Ocean is, in the Indian eyes more in the nature of a bang to announce Chinese superiority in the region." If some day the Americans discover they cannot turn the Indian Ocean into their "lake", they will have no compunction to induct Chinese presence into it. What else did Moynihan mean when he asked why the Indian Ocean should continue being called the Indian Ocean? He told the Press Club "Why call it the Indian Ocean? One may well call it the Madagascar Sea." Mr Swaran Singh, the then External Affairs Minister, gave a fitting answer in the Lok Sabha on March 6 1974 "Who is he to change the name based on geographical situation? It is no gift of the US Government or its Ambassador."

The apprehensions of India in regard to Pentagon's desire of building military bases in the Indian Ocean is shared by all Afro-Asian states. They look upon this and other bases as a source of menace to their sovereignty and independence to their processes of progressive national reconstruction started after their release from colonialism and to

their very peace and security. The non aligned countries and the Organisation of African Unity have all expressed their alarm at this ominous development. The organ of the African Society, Cairo, said (March 15, 1974)

"It is truly surprising to find the big Western nations talking of the security of the Indian Ocean at present, whereas they have long held numerous military bases in this area and in the countries overlooking the Ocean, such as the nuclear submarine base in Diego Garcia, which is American though the island is British-owned, the British base in the Maldive Island, the remains of British presence in Mauritius and the French base in Djibouti. Despite all attempts made by the liberation forces concerning this presence, which is regarded as a blatant phenomenon of imperialism and dependence, calls are being issued at present to reinforce this presence

"That direct military presence is associated with the numerous aspects of provocative measures adopted by Western powers vis a vis the non aligned nations, foremost among which are the military arsenals set up with the racist regimes opposed to African liberation, such as South Africa and Israel, and lately Rhodesia "

The people of Afro-Asian countries are legitimately concerned because the base is a danger pointed at their throat. Concern was especially caused when Western media circulated the news that two former Pentagon officers had informed the US Congress in March 1975 of the real reason for establishing in Diego Garcia a "multi purpose" base capable of launching air, ground and submarine operations should the need ever arise. They also said that the facilities contemplated would probably include not only an air strip to handle US Air Force's giant B 52 bombers, but a naval tender equipped to provide off shore maintenance to nuclear powered submarines carrying nuclear missiles.

The testimony also revealed that the Pentagon's Joint Chiefs of Staff, in listing about two dozen contingency needs for building Diego Garcia as a military base in their original request made in 1967, had also cited additional reasons like the need for sending US military assistance to Indo-China border, Indo-Pakistan border, Burma China border, etc. The US Navy's top brass, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, informed a Congressional Committee on March 21, 1974 that the main reason for converting the British atoll of Diego Garcia into a US military base in the Indian Ocean was to provide the ability to influence events in that area. "The capability to deploy our military power in the region is an essential element of such influence." An idea of "our military power" was given by the Defence Minister (April, 1974) saying the US Navy intends employing strategic submarines in the Indian Ocean more frequently as additional Poseidon submarines with long range missiles enter the inventory and as the trident submarine is acquired.

Another reason why the USA is bent upon disregarding Afro-Asian opinion against turning Diego Garcia into a military base is its desire of grabbing the rich economic resources of the vast stretches of territories of the littoral states. As the Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review* wrote, the US military-strategic and economic policies in the Indian Ocean region are designed to enable the USA and its Western partners to gain control over the raw materials of Afro-Asian countries. The Indian Ocean area is believed to be a rich reservoir of zinc, copper, lead, gold, silver, manganese and other rare metals as well as a wealth of marine life. Political opinion in these countries is therefore, unanimous in arriving at the conclusion that Diego Garcia will give military muscle to multinationals to carry out their "operation grab". What makes Pentagon take hasty steps towards the fulfilment of this objective is the fact that the historical transformation around the Indian Ocean—trans-

formation ushered in by the downfall of colonialism—is ir reversible and that its inherent dynamism is too powerful to be retarded or reversed. This is clearly seen in US plans drawn vis-a vis the oil rich Arab states determined to retain their sovereignty over their resources. As Gen Harbaksh Singh observed in a paper read on the national seminar on Indian Ocean held by the Disarmament Studies Division of the School of International Studies in February 1974

“The US permanent naval presence in the western region of the Indian Ocean is also directed towards pressurising the oil producing Arab states to lift the embargo of oil export to the USA, restore production of oil to the level of requirement of Western powers, and reduce the price of oil to an internationally viable economic level” (*Indian Ocean Power Rivalry*, p 5)

The US motive behind Diego Garcia is thus obvious. This is also obvious why the problem of the Zone of Indian Ocean has become a global problem with a bearing on the future of global peace. We must again draw attention to the considerable weakening of the West's positions in the Indian Ocean bases by the beginning of the seventies, the rapid and phenomenal growth of the national liberation movements, the increasing trends of progressive transformation of economies of hinterland states, their common desire to intensify the policy of non alignment with military blocs, the strengthening of their national independence, the intra regional cooperation as the various phenomena explaining the emergence of a trend in Washington's foreign policy of converting Indian Ocean into an exclusive American Zone of military influence and strength.

We must emphasise here that though Diego Garcia is a tiny island it symbolises a giant step taken forward by the ferocious tiger, that imperialism is, towards preying upon the Afro-Asian people, a goal it had set itself right from the inception of the cold war era. Diego Garcia is a vital

link in the chain of events beginning with the formation of aggressive blocs like SEATO CENTO and ANZUS aggression against Korea and Indo-China, intervention in West Asia. Of course the US strategy has been limping from one theatre of operation to another, from one region to another. It has all along had one motive i.e. to smother the awakening of the Afro-Asians and what is equally important it has had only one result—defeat and fiasco. Hence Pentagon's frenzied urgency to go ahead with its plan in the Indian Ocean.

The objective US imperialism has set itself is too diabolical to be hidden from the eyes of Afro-Asians. Pentagon is therefore using all the tricks in its bag to shield its real purpose from the public eye. One excuse or the other is offered. But the main excuse—a hang over from the cold war era—is that Diego Garcia is a riposte to the supposed Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean. President Ford without bashing an eyelash declared at his Press Conference on August 28, 1974 "I don't view this as any challenge to the Soviet Union which is operating three naval bases in the Indian Ocean." The US spokesmen have hinted that the three Indian Ocean bases used by Soviet Navy are in Somalia, Iraq and South Yemen. Are these charges correct?

L.I. Brezhnev has emphatically denied the USSR has any military bases in the Indian Ocean. "The Soviet Union has never had and has no intention now of building military bases in the Indian Ocean," he said addressing the 25th Congress of the CPSU. And we call on the US to take the same stand.

The permanent representative of the Government of the USSR in the United Nations has stated categorically in his letter to the UN Secretary General that the Soviet Union had no military base in the Indian Ocean (Letter No A/AC 159/9 dated June 18, 1974). It says

"The Soviet Union never had has not established and is not now establishing any military or naval bases in the Indian Ocean region Soviet ships and vessels have never posed a threat to anyone in that region In accordance with the existing rules of international law and with universally recognised international practice, they are engaged in training cruises and in the search for and recovery of Soviet spacecraft that splash down in the Indian Ocean It must also be borne in mind that transit routes from the European part of the USSR to the Soviet Far East pass through the Indian Ocean and that accordingly in order to ensure the safe passage of ships and vessels the Soviet Union is conducting scientific investigations in the region Normal duty calls by naval ships at various ports for the purpose of replenishing their supplies are tendenciously depicted in the report as the establishment of Soviet bases in the Indian Ocean region '

The US allegation has been refuted by the representatives of Yemen Somalia and Iraq The acting permanent representative of Yemen wrote to the UN Secretary General

"The position of my Government, which emanates from its strict adherence to the principle of non alignment opposes the presence of any foreign naval equipment in our area more emphatically in my country

We categorically reject as false and unfounded the implication that the access to the port of Hodeidah (Yemen) is discriminatory as favouring only the Soviet Navy (Letter No A/Ac 159/6 dated May 29 1975)

Miss Fatima Issak Bihi of Somalia said in the discussion at the ad hoc committee on the Indian Ocean set up by the United Nations

It was stated that according to United States sources the Soviet Union deployed naval warships in the western

part of the Indian Ocean in the Aden Somalia area and that the USSR have built a communication station near the Somalia port of Berbera to provide support for their fleet "

Miss Bihi said, "her government considered the conclusions unsubstantiated and without any foundation whatsoever " She said it were the US military interests and presence in the area which constituted a serious threat to the peace and a source of tension to the countries and peoples of the Indian Ocean Quoting the President of Somalia, she said, 'foreign military bases had never existed in her country in the past and they would never be allowed to exist in the future The port of Berbera merely offered refuelling and bunkering facilities to all ships without distinction " (Press Release GA/5056 dated September 17, 1974—Press Section, Office of the Public Information, United Nations)

The Iraqi representative, Ghassan Attyyah, in his speech at the UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, said

" the authors of the report should not have relied mainly on materials from certain limited sources A close scrutiny of the chapter dealing with the Soviet Union would reveal the fact that 11 out of 15 references were American "

Mr Attyyah said that "any study would be far from comprehensive if it failed to cover the major questions of military and naval alliances in the area The fact that the study was limited to the most visible element of a military and naval presence made it incomplete and, to a certain extent biased " (Indian Ocean Committee, 14th meeting (A M), Press Release GA/5056 September 17, 1974, Press Section, Office of the Public Information, United Nations)

Indian political opinion and leadership has rejected the Pentagon canard of the existence of Soviet bases in the Indian Ocean As Admiral S N Nanda stated in his paper at the seminar on Indian Ocean

"The emergence of various countries as independent

sovereign states after World War II and the withdrawal of the British sea power as the dominant power in this area has released new forces creating new tensions and new problems in this area. Many Western analysts have termed this as a 'power vacuum' in the area and talk of Super Power rivalry in the Indian Ocean. We have also been witnessing resurgence of strong national feelings in the newly independent countries who resent the establishment of foreign military bases on their territories. We have also witnessed the withdrawal of foreign powers from these bases during the last 25 years. They have, however, been looking for alternate bases on small uninhabited or thinly populated islands or atolls which they feel will be free from nationalist passions. The latest development by which Diego Garcia base is going to be developed as a major military base for the use of the United States naval and air forces will enable the United States to operate its forces in the Indian Ocean area without the necessity of these forces having to be withdrawn for replenishment, repair, recreation and other facilities which will now be provided at Diego Garcia. It has been stated that the United States is forced to take this step to match the induction of Soviet naval forces in the Indian Ocean area. While this is a fact that the Soviet navy has deployed certain forces during the last 45 years in the Indian Ocean they have not established any base facilities in the manner in which the United States base facilities are being established in Diego Garcia. (*Indian Ocean Power Rivalry, Introduction p XI*)

What are these 'certain forces' of Soviet navy in the Indian Ocean like? Moscow has not denied the cruising of its ships in the waters of the Indian Ocean for non military peaceful purposes. Prof Zafar Imam, Head of the Centre of Soviet Studies, School of International Studies, explained at the seminar that during the first 38 years of existence of the USSR the Indian Ocean was simply a matter of geo-

graphy" to that country. It was from 1955 onwards, he added, when the USSR embarked upon a long range programme of aid and assistance to the newly-liberated Afro-Asian countries, notably Egypt and India, that the "Indian Ocean assumed importance for Soviet merchant shipping". As the Soviet Union became "more and more involved in Asian affairs as an Asian power the volume of trade and commerce grew with Asian countries as also the frequency of Soviet shipping vessels in the Indian Ocean". Hence, the Professor concludes, the increasing Asian context in Soviet policy, in general, resulted in the presence of Soviet vessels in the Indian Ocean" (Ibid., p. 14)

Rebuffing the US argument of justifying its presence on the plea that it is required to match "menacing Soviet strength" in the region, the learned Professor told the seminar

"the Soviet defence expenditure is still heavily committed to deterrence. Except for some shoring facilities, we still do not know of any Soviet base in the Indian Ocean."

The Soviet Union, unlike Europe, has been extremely sensitive to the nationalism of the newly emergent states of the Third World particularly in Asia. She has not yet embarked on any project which would hurt the nationalist aspirations of Asian countries. The clear implication is that the Soviet leadership would like to opt out of a potential armed rivalry in the region" (Ibid., pp. 16-17)

The peaceful character of Soviet shipping in the Indian Ocean is also attested by the fact that, as Admiral A K Chatterji told the seminar, its "size has never been so large as to cause concern" (Ibid., p. 8). Merchant vessels, hydrographic ships, oceanographic ships, fishing trawlers, ships for recovery of spacecraft—such is the character of "menacing" Soviet naval strength in the Indian Ocean. Then why this formidable building of US nuclear, military base at Diego Garcia? Why have a sledge hammer to kill a fly?

The US representatives themselves have let the cat out

of the bag. They have themselves explained that the USSR poses no threat to the peace of the Indian Ocean, that their military bases have motives other than those officially advanced by Washington to cloud the minds of people both in America as well as in Asian and African countries, and that the "ghost" Soviet bases have been contrived by Pentagon magicians to call for the existence of their own real ones.

On April 4, 1974 Rep Lee H Hamilton of the US House of Representatives rose to speak against Section 301 of the defence supplementary bill authorising an expenditure of 29 million dollars to create a permanent naval base and support facilities for US naval and air forces including aircraft carriers and submarines at Diego Garcia. Congressman Hamilton insisted that there was not a single national interest affecting the welfare of the American people requiring an overseas base in the area which, hitherto, did not contain that type of facility. The United States currently has naval superiority in the Indian Ocean. On the other hand, Hamilton noted, the Soviet Union had no base in the area nor was there any evidence that the Soviets were acquiring bases. Hamilton told the Congress that some Soviet visits to ports in Somalia, Iraq, Mauritius, etc., were expressions of friendly political relations with these countries (Congressional Record, April 4, 1974).

According to *Defence Monitor* (April 1974), Soviet assistance 'to harbour development' in littoral countries does not seem to have led to special military base rights.

Even Rear Admiral Charles D Grejan, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, admitted that "we have to sort of watch the word 'base' here because the Russians do not have bases *per se*" (Ibid).

In Congressional hearings, Rep James Foulton noted that it was "only logical to me that the USSR should want a water route as well as a land route to get from the western

to the eastern part of the country and vice versa" (United States House of Representatives, 92nd Congress)

Seymour Weiss, Director of the Politico-Military Affairs Bureau of the US State Department, in his recorded testimony (in March 1974) before the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee on Near East and South Asia, when asked whether the US would be prepared to deescalate their naval activity in the Indian Ocean if the Russians agreed to do likewise, categorically said "No". He also revealed that the purpose behind setting up the Diego Garcia base was to "take care" of the Middle East oil on which West Europe and Japan depended and to deploy the US Navy "to augment diplomatic process" in the Indian Ocean area where "there was instability in some of the countries".

The former Assistant Director of the US Navy Strategic Planning, Rear Admiral La Roque, stated before the same House Affairs Committee

"The Navy began looking for post Vietnam missions with which to occupy itself—we are kind of running out of commitments and if we could make a commitment out of Diego Garcia as a permanent place to defend, we could then rationalise coming to Congress for a permanent Navy in the Indian Ocean. The name of the game is Russians are coming."

This is the old played-out trick of imperialism. It did not make any headway earlier; it will not make any headway now. What the littoral and hinterland states of the Indian Ocean have to beware of is that these bases have not turned into military outposts against the peace loving region and against their national interests. That is why one of the crucial phases of the struggle of the non aligned for world peace is to ensure that the Indian Ocean is turned into a Zone of Peace. A relevant UN declaration was adopted in 1971 and since then many international forums, including the UN General

Assembly, OAU conferences of non aligned countries, and public organisations like the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation, the World Peace Council, etc., have endorsed the decision. *The Soviet Union and Afro-Asian states have more than once come out in support of this idea*

The issue, however, is no nearer solution because imperialist strategists have begun paying more attention to the Indian Ocean for a number of reasons. The defeat of US imperialism in Indo-China, the consistently anti imperialist foreign policy of India under the leadership of Mrs Gandhi, the stepping up of the liberation struggle in the south of Arabian Peninsula, the progressive transformations in several East African countries (Somalia, Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Mozambique), the winning of independence by more nations in the region (Mozambique, the Comores and the Seychelles), the reopening of the Suez Canal—all these are added reasons for US imperialism to continue pressing ahead its plans in the Indian Ocean despite world wide opposition

Pursuing the feverish arms race, Pentagon plans to develop new systems of weapons by 1978, including the Trident missile. The US strategists believe this missile can effectively threaten the countries of the socialist community, above all the Soviet Union, if stationed in the Indian Ocean basin

A chain of imperialist war bases are located, apart from Diego Garcia, in Christmas and Cocos, which cross the Indian Ocean. These bases are used by imperialist powers, not only for their military strategic purposes, but also to ensure their control over the trade routes of littoral countries. It should be mentioned here that the imperialist powers quickly build up their military potential in the area of the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea, which poses an immediate threat to Asian and African countries

It is no accident that the Soviet Union, in sharp contrast to Western powers, supports the idea of turning the area into a Zone of Peace and believes that détente is needed in this re-

gion as well since the development of naval bases of Western powers poses a direct threat to the countries of the Indian Ocean basin. There are nearly 50 of them including hinterland countries to which the routes over the Indian Ocean are essential. Apart from that these bases pose a threat to the Soviet Union and other countries including the countries of the socialist community.

Before we elaborate upon the question of turning the Indian Ocean into a Zone of Peace we would like to refer here briefly to the disruptive role Iran has been playing in the region. The Shah of Iran put out the scare story that Soviet naval units had spent 9 000 shipping days in the Indian Ocean. He deliberately hid from the world public the well known fact that these days were mainly accounted for by the presence of Soviet mine sweepers dredgers and other specialised naval ships engaged for one and a half years at the request of the Bangladesh Government in clearing the harbours and approach channels of Chittagong and Khulna ports of the sunken vessels and war debris left by the retreating Pakistani forces in the 1971 war. The Shah has the audacity to call this grand job of assistance as sinister. The US has always counted upon Shah's Iran—and racist Israel—as pressure points in the Arab world. The reactionary circles of Iran in collaboration with Britain once invaded Yemen and tried to encircle the People's Republic of Yemen and to inflict hard blows on the national liberation movement in Dhofar. These circles are working in concert with the conservative regimes of Saudi Arabia in order to create a reactionary Teheran Riyadh Oman axis where Iran will play a leading role in carrying out the new imperialist policy.

We in India cannot overlook the fact that Pakistan has been the main beneficiary of Iran's US backed growing military power in the region. The Government of Pakistan publicly admitted the help Iran gave it in the anti India wars.

of 1965 and 1971. The navies of the two countries have been taking part in joint exercises in the Arabian Sea since 1958 under the auspices of CENTO. Referring to Pakistan-Iran naval cooperation, the *Jerusalem Post* speculated (January 9, 1975) "Iran, which can afford a powerful navy, and Pakistan may be planning to try to make the northern half of the Arabian Sea their private waters."

At the same time, Pakistan's official press makes a distinction between the USA and the USSR, issuing special warnings to the latter only as regards exclusion of "Big Power" build up in the Indian Ocean. Although Mr Bhutto was originally committed to Pakistan's withdrawal from Western military alliances, in practice the withdrawal has remained confined only to SEATO. Pakistan remains an active member of CENTO, seeking its intervention in the solution of the problems of the subcontinent. In June 1973, at the ministerial council meeting of the CENTO in Teheran, Pakistan was reported to have sought a revised role for CENTO in the light of the "new threat" from Soviet friendship treaties with India and Iraq. Replying to questions at a news conference, the CENTO Secretary General said the pact members had "reviewed" and discussed Soviet "military pacts" with India and Iraq and admitted that CENTO "discussed methods how to combat the threat." He refused to elaborate.

As was explained by Prof. Satish Kumar at the seminar on the Indian Ocean, the contradiction between Pakistan's vigorously revived interest in the CENTO and its lip service to the concept of a peace zone emerges still more sharply if one recalled Mrs. Srimavo Bandaranaike's statement in her speech at the UN General Assembly on October 12, 1971 that all areas covering the non-aligned states should, by definition, be Zones of Peace. Pakistan's support to this concept of non-alignment is more formal and propagandist than genuine and based on conviction. Secondly, Pakistan, like Moynihan, is obsessed with the inappropriateness of the

name of the Indian Ocean. This is a reflection of Pakistan's discomfiture at the importance that India legitimately gets by its historic association with the name of the Indian Ocean. Pakistani spokesmen have proposed, quite a number of times that the name should be changed.

The idea of Zone of Peace was first advanced by Sri Lanka. Ever since 1956, when Mr S W R D Bandaranaike became the Prime Minister, Sri Lanka has been following the policy of non alignment. Mr Bandaranaike put non alignment into practice by asking the British to withdraw from the air and naval bases in the island. It is in pursuance of this policy held by the United Front Government that Mrs Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the present Prime Minister, proposed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in Singapore that the Indian Ocean be declared a Zone of Peace. At the 26th General Assembly of the United Nations held the same year she moved a formal proposal that the world body declare the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace. She said that the "proposal should not be regarded as a part of a scheme of collective security confined to the Indian Ocean. On the contrary, it is intended as a direct, tangible contribution to the strengthening of disarmament and creation of conditions for world peace." It is known that 61 nations voted for this proposal with none against.

The resolution called upon the great powers to enter into immediate consultations with the littoral states of the Indian Ocean with a view to

(a) halting further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean

(b) eliminating from the Indian Ocean all bases military installations and logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of Great Power military presence in the Indian Ocean

It also called upon the littoral and hinterland states of the Indian Ocean, the permanent members of the Security Council and other mass maritime users of the Indian Ocean in pursuit of the objective of establishing a system of collective security without military alliance and strengthening international security through regional and other cooperation to enter into consultations with a view to implementing this Declaration and such action as may be necessary to ensure that

(a) warships and military aircraft may not use the Indian Ocean for any threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or independence of any littoral or hinterland state of the Indian Ocean in contravention of the purpose and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

(b) subject to the foregoing and to the norms and principles of international law, the right to free and unimpeded use of the Ocean by the vessels of all nations is unaffected

(c) appropriate arrangements are made to give effect to any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

The Foreign Ministers of the non aligned states who met in Guyana unanimously endorsed this Declaration and affirmed its importance in the strengthening of security and cooperation in certain regions of the world. The Declaration was followed by further action in the United Nations General Assembly the following year by the appointment of an ad hoc committee of 15 members to study the implementation of the Declaration consistent with the security interests of the littoral and hinterland states and the right of free and unimpeded use of the ocean for legitimate maritime purposes. This time the resolution was adopted with 95 voting in favour and none against

The General Assembly at its 28th session considered the report of this committee and adopted a further resolution to expedite its work of the ad hoc committee urging the states

to accept the principles and objective of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace requested the ad hoc committee to carry out consultations in accordance with its mandate and submit its recommendations to the General Assembly and urged on states especially the major powers "to extend their cooperation to the ad hoc committee in the discharge of its functions."

As usual China struck a discordant note in the General Assembly. The Chinese delegate attacked the USSR most viciously repeating the arguments Pentagon has been advancing to justify US naval presence in the Indian Ocean.

The Maoist propagandists have consistently resorted to slandering the Soviet position proclaimed from time to time at the UN and outside, in government statements and newspaper comments. But Chinese standpoint does not undergo any change committed as it is to defending the indefensible. The paper *Jenmin Jihpao*, published a commentary in which it actually set out to justify imperialist strategy of setting up bases in the Indian Ocean while making all kinds of allegations against the Soviet Union. The paper alleged that the Soviet Union dreamt of getting hold of ice-free ports in southern seas and that it had already built a number of military bases in the area. The paper however passed in silence over the fact of existence of real and not mythical military bases of imperialist powers in the area—bases which stretch from the west coast of Australia to the south of Africa and which in the firm opinion of developing states continue to threaten their sovereignty and are an instrument of interference in their internal affairs.

At a time when withdrawal of US military personnel from Thailand has started the Maoists team up with Pentagon which is striving to preserve at any cost the US military presence in Thailand and the Peking press seeks to intimidate the people of that land with the bogey of Soviet menace.

According to Jenmin Jihpao, the conservative governments of Australia and New Zealand maintain a "just stand". These governments came out, at a recent conference at Rotorua, against the proposal of the countries of South Pacific forum creating a nuclear free zone in the area. (It should be noted that this proposal was approved by United Nations General Assembly). Among "just" measures, the Maoists also classify the consent given by the participants in the South Pacific forum to calls paid at their ports by US warships armed with nuclear weapons. They gave this consent under the influence of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand.

However, truth cannot be submerged under the torrent of lies coming from Peking. Non aligned states have learnt to distinguish between those who sincerely support their striving to live in peace and tranquillity and who try to push them off their chosen road guided by self seeking interests. These states will also see through the manoeuvres of Peking which is ready to assist US imperialists in carrying out their plans in the Indian Ocean.

India has consistently supported the proposal of turning the Indian Ocean into a Zone of Peace. It not only co-sponsored the resolution in the UN, which ultimately became the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, but has also worked actively within the UN and outside it for achieving the objectives of the Declaration. The true sentiments of all Indian people were expressed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi in an interview to *Le Figaro* of France (January 23, 1976) in which she said:

The present situation in Indian Ocean now, if it grows, affects us and the countries of the littoral states have expressed a desire that it should be an area of peace and cooperation.

She had been expressing these feelings even earlier at public forums and in talks with representatives of other lit

toral states. Launching the frigate Nilgiris in October 1968 she had expressed the hope that the Indian Ocean would always remain an area of peace and "as bridge of understanding" between the nations.

The idea of turning Indian Ocean into a Peace Zone is making a rapid headway and winning an increasing number of adherents from the states of the Indian Ocean basin. The idea has received the wholehearted support of non aligned states at their Algiers conference. The idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a Zone of Peace is inextricably woven with the non aligned states struggle for peace and security threatened by the oceanic strategy of US imperialism. Peace in the Indian Ocean is a part of the overall plan of collective security towards which all countries of the region are moving in their individual interests and the collective interests of the Afro-Asian community as a whole.

CHAPTER XI

Coexistence for Peace and Security in Asia

Asia is a continent of 45 states with 60 per cent of the world population. Its wealth and resources are immense but for centuries they have been plundered by colonial powers. Its manpower is also colossal but it has been used by these powers for their self aggrandisement. The world's largest and most populous continent has been bled white by 'White' colonial powers. They waged wars of conquest and plunder and spared no weapons to subjugate its countries and peoples. If the atom bomb had first to be 'tried and tested,' it was to be dropped on an Asian country. If the efficacy of napalm bomb in burning human flesh had to be ascertained, it was first to be rained down on an Asian country. And if modern electronically-controlled war weapons were to be tested on human cannon fodder, the victims were again to be Asians. After World War II Asia has seen more devastating use of fire power than any other region of the world in wars known to human history. Experimenting the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, napalm bombs in Korea, poisonous gases and defoliants in Vietnam—such is the dark legacy of imperialism in this continent of ours. In the US aerial bombing of Vietnam, a Hiroshima was enacted every third day in terms of TNT.

It is not easy for us Asians to forget the past. It is not easy to heal our wounds. And it is not easy either to ensure that new wounds will not be inflicted on the body of this tragic continent.

Sleep in Peace This Will Not Happen Again

These are the words carved on the memorial to the victims of Hiroshima. These are the sentiments of an Asian to-day who saw his father done to death by a British sergeant, his wife raped by a French colonel, his child maimed by an American G.I. Asia has suffered long but not bent an inch. It has seen its sons gobbled up by imperialist wars but their unyielding spirit lives on in their children determined to turn their continent into a continent free from aggression and conflagration, free from alien rule and plunder, a continent of peace and security. Ask any Asian what he wants most. He will say 'No more wars'. Ask him how this can be ensured. "Through peace and security," he will answer unfailingly.

In the past few years imperialist scholars and writers have turned out a number of works trying to justify the West's 'po'ice actions' in Asia. This view was clearly expressed for example, by the former US Secretary of Defence, Robert McNamara in his book *The Essence of Security*. These viewpoints hide the main reason accounting for conflicts in Asia or, for that matter in the Third World. The basis of these conflicts lies in the fundamental contradiction between the national liberation movements and imperialism—a contradiction the non-aligned countries have sought to resolve in favour of the former. In the post-war period this contradiction has sharpened. In many cases the imperialist powers have sought to resolve it by taking recourse to armed suppression of the national liberation movement which, in certain cases, have escalated into major "local" wars with inherent dangers of expanding into global conflicts. We have the well-known examples of French wars in Indo-China of US aggression

in the region after French withdrawal, of Holland's wars in Indonesia, of British wars in former Malaya. These wars can be called Third-World conflicts only in geographical terms for essentially these were imperialist wars against the Asian people's liberation movements. The entire course of post war development has conclusively demonstrated that colonialism and aggression, the policy of colonial tyranny and the policy of force, are essentially two sides of one and the same coin.

In spite of such stubborn facts of history some Western authors attribute all armed conflicts in Asia primarily to infighting among Asians themselves, to their acute religious strifes and dissensions and cultural diversities, rival territorial ambitions, etc. We see these arguments evaluated in several works, e.g., in Wenner Levi's *The Challenge of World Politics in South and South-East Asia*, in T D B Millar's *The Politics of the Third World*, in Dick Wilson's *Asia Awakes—A Continent In Transition*, etc., Wenner Levi, for instance, calls the introduction of cold-war politics in the Asian region, as a factor for stoking armed conflicts, 'faddish and artificial'.

We Asians know that most intra-regional conflicts of our continent are the doings of the colonial powers. Though they have departed from the continent, they have left behind what are called 'time bombs' to be detonated as and when desired by them, as and when suitable to their military strategic needs. That these conflicts are rooted in Asia's colonial past is admitted even by several Western scholars. They emphasise the well known fact of our history that the territorial arrangements, the religious and ethnic composites of the population, the basis of internal socio political structure, the shape of economy, etc., all took shape under colonialism and under its *distorting influences*. British scholar A. Lamb, for instance, writes

"No Asian state came through the colonial period with

its boundaries unmodified. All, to a greater or lesser extent, owe the present alignment of their boundaries to historical processes which took place during the colonial era." (Asian Frontiers, London, 1968, p 74)

The essence of these processes, in his opinion, was that the colonial powers "assumed the right to carve up Asia and Africa in a manner which suited their own needs but did not of necessity meet the requirements of the Asian and African peoples concerned" (Ibid., p 10)

In the course of colonial conquest, the borders of most Asian states underwent incredible changes. Where the subjugated state was one with established national boundaries, entire regions were severed and new states set up, while the colonies of different European countries were set up on the territories of once integral state. The history of India's colonial conquest is highly indicative of this fact. Alongside 'British' India colonies of Portugal and France were also set up. As for Britain itself, it repeatedly carved and re-carved the boundaries of various principalities and states (The Cambridge Modern History, Vol XI, "The Growth of Nationalities," 1969, pp 743-744)

Tribes and peoples found themselves frequently within the framework of one territory even when they had not established any economic ties. It is not surprising, therefore, that these tribes entertained feelings of hostility, suspicion and enmity for each other—a state of affairs on which the colonial powers thrived.

The advent of independence would have put an end to this state of affairs if the imperialists had not come to base their new policies on deliberately aggravating the problems they themselves had created, if they had not "heated up" national, religious, inter regional, inter tribal, inter state contradictions.

The wars imposed on Asian people by colonial powers, as often repeated earlier, were sought to be legitimised in

the name of "anti-communism" "The ideology of anti-communism strips rebellion of legitimacy and exalts the suppression of revolution as an act of liberation," wrote the US Scholar R Barmet in his *Intervention and Revolution* (1968, p 60) This weapon proved too fragile to stand the strong evidence on the contrary The "theory" of "anti-communism" then gave way, especially after the sixties, to one of "political vacuum" sought to be filled by the West The US policy planners evolved the "vacuum theory" which says that Washington is to fill the "vacuum" supposed to be created after the departure of colonial powers from the scene It was Jawaharlal Nehru who debunked this "theory" in a speech in the Lok Sabha on March 25, 1957

"How is that vacuum to be filled? It can only be filled by the people of that country growing and developing themselves economically, politically and otherwise"

The Indian Ocean area, as discussed earlier, is increasingly becoming a strategic centre in US plans which look upon it as an "emergency exit" to South-East Asia and as a strategic "key" opening the "door" to India, East Africa and to a large part of the oil rich Middle East The plan to turn the coral atoll of Diego Garcia into a first rate military outpost has to be viewed in the light of the threat posed to the security of the region "A Western military presence is necessary to maintain the balance of power in the Indian Ocean area," said the *Daily Telegraph* (January 1, 1968)

Asia has had a special place in the strategy of the US which hopes to take the place of outgoing colonial powers It is with this objective that Washington has set up a ring of bases in the region and knocked together aggressive military pacts Of its one million strong well-equipped military forces serving abroad over 6,00,000 were reported to be stationed in Asia before the conclusion of the Vietnam war Besides, its most deadly naval fleet, the 7th Fleet, with its nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and submarines,

permanently cruised in West Pacific, and its strategic nuclear weapons were stored in Okinawa, Guam and Hawaii. The network of US military bases criss-cross the Asian continent, with 150 of them being in Japan alone. An extensive chain of bases had been set up in Thailand (now in the process of being dismantled), South Korea, Taiwan and Philippines.

The imperialist fiasco in Indo-China, the decision to disband the SEATO, the rebuff given to Washington by President Marcos of Philippines, the decision taken by Thailand to ask the Pentagon to pull out its troops from the land all point to the failure of the strategic concepts of the US in Asia. This however, does not mean it has given up its expansionist schemes. The *Christian Science Monitor* said for instance, that the fall of the corrupt Thieu regime in South Vietnam did not mean the US had to quit the Asian waters immediately. Stability required the presence of the US there, it added. A statement to the same effect was made by Philip Habib, US Assistant Secretary of State, during his visits to Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur and Singapore. He said the US, as an "Asian and Pacific Power", would play its role 'in its own interest'.

Though the old type colonial powers have been forced to stage an exit from Asia, it would be naive to believe they would not attempt a re-entry in one garb or another, under one pretext or another. In his address to the Royal Central Asian Society on 13 March, 1968, Sir Esler Denning, formerly of the British Foreign Service and Chairman of the Council of Royal Central Asian Society, denied that the decision for military withdrawal from South East Asia and the Persian Gulf signified 'that we consider ourselves as no longer having a role to play in Asia as a whole.' Sir Denning further said 'We have felt obliged to withdraw our forces at short notice in circumstances by no means favourable to us' (*Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, Vol. IV, Part II, June 1968 pp. 136-139). By adopting for the time

being "a low military profile" in Asia, the old colonial powers are only looking forward to the recession of the wave of anti colonialism in the hope that the disillusioned statesmen would then be willing to cooperate with the West. The process of decolonisation has been viewed by Sir Denning as "certain malaise which is "like eating too much too fast which results in flatulence and indigestion with spells of dizziness and outbursts of ill temper. The pace will slacken and turbulence subside."

Western colonialism, thus has not abandoned its plans of staging a "back-door" entry into Asia. In fact, though driven out, it very much stands at our door step, waiting for a suitable opportunity for a chink in our ranks to be widened to facilitate its sneaking entrance. The West's proposal of sending foreign troops to Kashmir was a classic example of the lurking danger. The Asian people will overlook it at peril to their own sovereignty and freedom peace and security.

All these facts go to establish that colonial and neo-colonial forces, pursuing their economic and military strategic designs, still pose a direct and immediate threat to the peace and security of our continent, to its stability and freedom, to its sovereignty and independent development. Collective security of Asia has, therefore, acquired an urgency and its achievement has been facilitated by the increasing process of detente, by the crisis in the policy of "bloc and pact politics", by the defeat of the policy of cold war and by the increasing trend towards cooperation in place of confrontation.

Opinion in India is near unanimous in upholding that non alignment was and remains the bedrock of the country's approach to problems of peace and security. While the general framework of security as envisaged by India is provided by the Panchsheel or the five principles of peaceful coexistence, the concrete measures suggested or supported by

India for the promotion of the ideal of collective security in Asia are the creation of a **Zone of Peace** in the Indian Ocean neutralisation of South-east Asia and the adoption of an Asian Convention ensuring respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the region and the neutrality of such countries as wish to remain neutral. The Indian approach to security rejects the neo-colonialist "vacuum" concept. Further, the Indian aim is to build a structure of regional security in Asia in keeping with the principles of the UN Charter. Collective security in Asia is to be viewed as a long term objective to be realised without outside interference and primarily through non military means by mutually beneficial economic cooperation among the nations of the region.

Political analysts have been observing of late that there is a marked accent on regional economic cooperation in the Indian approach to problems of security in Asia. If earlier economic cooperation was thought of mostly in terms of expansion of inter regional trade, they state, the recent stress is on deeper economic cooperation such as establishment of joint industrial projects and creation of various financial and economic Asian institutions through the Asian Council of Ministers an ECAFE agency. Besides multilateral efforts India is trying to further strengthen economic cooperation on a bilateral basis with countries like Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan.

India has nothing to do with military blocs directed against definite states or group of states and she aims at embracing all the states of a given geographical region. We believe that security could only be ensured by collective efforts through commitments undertaken by all countries or on a regional basis and insist that far from replacing the United Nations the regional security system must complement it. The approach to the development of regional econo

mic cooperation for creating a climate conducive to security is of great importance

India has been a great factor of peace in the Asian continent. Through its policy of non alignment it has made a notable contribution not only to security in Asia but also to world peace. At the present juncture of history when great positive changes are taking place in international relations, towards which India has made no mean contribution, our country under Mrs Indira Gandhi's leadership is displaying with renewed vigour the dynamism of the Nehru era and facing the new challenges.

Why the Soviet Union is in favour of this plan? L.I. Brezhnev explained it, with his classic brevity, in August 1973 at a meeting in Alma Ata.

'We do so because we seek to exclude wars, armed conflicts and imperialist aggression on the Asian continent, we want every country and every people to be guaranteed conditions for free development and national regeneration, we want a spirit of trust and mutual understanding to prevail in relations among Asian countries.'

The basic framework of collective security in Asia is a kind of a code of peaceful, good neighbourly relations between Asian countries and peoples. It includes renunciation of use of force in relations between states, respect for sovereignty and inviolability of borders, non interference in domestic affairs, and broad based economic and other types of cooperation on the basis of complete equality and mutual benefit. It envisages the right of each country to decide its own destiny, the inadmissibility of seizure of territory by means of aggression, the inalienable right of each country to sovereign possession of its natural resources and carrying out of socio-economic transformations and the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means.

Renunciation of use of force in relations between states is an important principle of modern international law. The

principle of non use of force has been written in clause 4 of Article 2 of the UN Charter "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations" The main purpose of the United Nations is to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war The sphere of operation of this principle is rather wide, though—and this must be stressed here—the principle does not extend to cases of justified and lawful adoption of effective measures to avert a threat to peace, to fight back acts of aggression and other violations of peace The UN Declaration on Principles of International Law stresses that nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall be construed as enlarging or diminishing in any way the scope of the provisions of the Charter concerning cases in which the use of force is lawful'

It should be pointed out that direct armed aggression on the part of imperialist and pro imperialist forces, as was the case in Korea, and later in Indo-China and the Middle East, presents a most brutal form of use of force The constant threats of use of force gravely complicate the cause of ensuring stable peace in Asia inasmuch as these threats are unlawful and illegal from the viewpoint of international law This is graphically borne out by recent reports in the US press and even by statements made by some officials in Washington about the possibility of using armed force by the United States against the oil producing countries of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf area if some 'special circumstances' arise

This is not just a solitary case of imperialists' black mailing Asian countries It is not at all a rare case that imperialist troops are concentrated near the borders of an Asian state that the Navy and Air Force flaunt their might, and that other kinds of threats force are issued In recent years

imperialists have been giving increasing attention to establishing new military bases in Asia and the adjacent areas, in particular, in the Indian Ocean

This cannot but evoke concern among Asian states which rightly regard imperialist military bases as a spring board for aggression against them. It is only natural that the countries and peoples of Asia should come out in favour of an early solution of the problem of eliminating foreign military bases in the territories of other countries

Asian people are also well aware of the grave consequences which may arise as a result of applying political and economic pressures by imperialism and reaction. It is for this reason that the Cairo Declaration, adopted by the Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non Aligned Countries (1964), stressed that the use of force may assume different forms: military, political and economic

It is clear that the principle of non use of force does not rule out resistance of blackmail by armed force and to the use of political and economic pressures. It also does not rule out repulsing direct military aggression

Besides, one should bear in mind that renunciation of threat of use of force concerns only the sphere of inter-state relations and does not extend to settlement of domestic problems. The principle of non use of force can in no way hamper the exercise of the inalienable right of peoples to decide their own destinies themselves

Of late, the principle of non use of force is gaining ever more recognition in Asian countries and is being adopted in their mutual relations. The Simla agreement between Pakistan and India, and other joint documents signed by Asian states, are its glaring examples. The Soviet Union, which has concluded friendship treaty with India and Iraq, with countries committing themselves to consistently abide by the principle of non use of force, makes a major contribution to the establishment of this principle

Non use of force in relations between states is inseparably connected with peaceful settlement of international disputes. In conformity with this principle, all states should settle by peaceful means international disputes or situations which may result in violation of peace. As clause 3 of Article 2 of the UN Charter states, "all Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered."

Peaceful settlement of international disputes is thus a generally recognised principle of international law, an obligatory norm of relations among states.

Means of peaceful settlement are increasingly becoming established practices in international relations, being used on the basis of voluntary choice and agreement between the two sides. The path of negotiations, bilateral and multilateral, has more than once demonstrated its universal character and efficiency in Asia as well. In most cases it helps the sides establish businesslike contacts, guarantee their equality, create favourable prerequisites for a quest for mutually acceptable compromise, and, in the final analysis, for reaching final agreement on the settlement of an international dispute.

Methods such as good offices and mediation have proved helpful in settling international disputes in Asia. This was graphically demonstrated by the settlement of the armed conflict between Pakistan and India in 1965, largely due to the good offices of the Soviet Union at the Tashkent Conference.

Peaceful settlement of disputes presupposes strict observance of commitments contained in international treaties and agreements. It is on this basis alone that the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means can be successful and durable. Of course what we mean here are treaties which are in full accord with international law.

Respect for sovereignty and inviolability of b

also constitutes a basic principle of international law, and its strict observance contributes to the cause of ensuring durable peace and dependable security of nations, their friendship, cooperation and social progress

As applied to countries, sovereignty means supremacy of the state over its territory, its independence in international relations without any violation of the sovereign rights of other states and of the generally recognised norms of international law. With the beginning of the era of downfall of colonialism there has been a steady growth of opportunities for young states to exercise their sovereign rights to juridical equality, territorial integrity and political independence, to choose and develop their political, social and economic system, and to establish and consolidate peaceful relations and mutually advantageous cooperation with other states. Consequently, favourable conditions are arising for an unfailing implementation of the principle of respect for state sovereignty, which is increasingly taking root in international politics.

As has already been mentioned, territorial supremacy, i.e., the exclusive jurisdiction of the state over its own territory, is an organic element of state sovereignty. State borders, like its territory itself, are inviolable. The principle of inviolability of borders constitutes a generally recognised norm of international law, and a violation of this principle is regarded as an unlawful act incompatible with the provisions of the UN Charter.

The inadmissibility of annexation of territory by means of aggression in this context is quite obvious. This principle is also embodied in the UN Charter and in many other international documents.

Respect for national sovereignty is inseparable from the recognition of the right of each country to decide its own destiny, i.e., to establish such a social system and choose such a form of government which it considers expedient and nece-

ssary for ensuring its social, economic and cultural development. This right includes two mutually supplementary elements: on the one hand, free choice by the country of its international status and, on the other, independent arrangement and settlement of its internal affairs by its people. The second element presupposes guarantees for freedom of expression of will by people and renunciation by other states of any encroachments on this freedom.

The principles of respect for state sovereignty and the right of nations to self-determination underlie the UN Charter. These have been repeatedly confirmed in most important international documents, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted in 1960 by the UN General Assembly, the Declaration of Bandung (1955), and the Cairo (1957) Conferences of Asian and African States, as well as the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Belgrade (1961), Cairo (1964), Lusaka (1970) and Algiers (1973).

Historical experience shows that political independence of countries and nations cannot be fully guaranteed unless they have attained economic independence. National sovereignty is inseparable from the right of countries to sovereign possession of natural resources and carrying out of socio-economic transformation. This right is now being increasingly recognised in international relations, which is testified, for example, by the decision of the Algiers Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries (1973) and the 6th Special Session (1974) of the UN General Assembly on Problems of Raw Materials and Development.

The unconditional recognition of the principle of national sovereignty is of great importance to Asian countries. They have gained vast successes in their struggle for freedom and independence. But imperialism and reaction have not yet given up their attempts, overt or covert, to violate and even grossly trample upon the sovereignty of newly

liberated Asian nations

Actually, Peking, too, has been directing its efforts in the same direction. China's foreign policy, based on great power and hegemonistic strivings, shows an utter contempt for the sovereign rights and national interests of Asian peoples and countries. We recall here the treacherous stand adopted by the Peking leaders in relation to the liberation struggle of the people of Bangladesh.

Asia still has on its territories outposts of colonialism, with several million people suffering from foreign domination. Hong Kong, seized from China by British colonialists, is today the biggest colony in Asia. Despite its high-sounding words spoken in support of colonial people's liberation struggle, Peking does not lift even its little finger to help the people of that territory—which is Chinese from time immemorial—to free themselves from colonial dependence. On the contrary, Peking prefers to use that territory for carrying out profitable commercial operations and economic deals with Western powers.

Colonialism is obviously incompatible with respect for the sovereignty of nations and states. Preservation of colonial dependence in any form is a gross violation of the norms of international law. The UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples qualifies refusal to grant freedom or putting of obstacles on the way to freedom of those peoples and countries as a threat to universal peace.

Territorial claims and border disputes were among the main reasons for numerous international conflicts and wars. Violations of the principles of inviolability of borders and of inadmissibility of annexation by means of aggression are still practised in Asia. In Asia proper and beyond it there are forces demanding a division of territory in the continent.

Enjoying the support from across the seas, Israeli ruling

circles seized in 1967 a considerable part of Arab territories and they have been stubbornly seeking to continue the occupation. At the same time, Tel Aviv tramples upon the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine trying in particular, to reject their right to have a statehood of their own.

Groundless geopolitical claims constitute a major aspect of Peking's hegemonistic line. Chinese leaders jeopardise the principle of inviolability of borders and territories of a number of states. Well known are Peking's provocative claims on the territories of other states, and its aggressive postures on its border with India and with other Asian countries. Even new maps are published in China showing parts of territories of India, Burma, Malaysia, Thailand, Laos and other countries of South and South East Asia as in its possession. This is fraught with dangerous consequences and arouses the legitimate concern of the countries neighbouring on China. In 1974 China took armed action against the Paracel Islands in South China Sea. Of late, it is becoming evident that Peking's expansionist ambitions are being stirred up by the discovery of oil deposits at the bed of seas washing the coasts of the continent.

Moreover, the leaders of China try to use for their own selfish interests disputes between Asian states. The fuss raised occasionally by the Chinese propaganda around the so-called issue of Kashmir—an integral part of India—may serve as an example. Peking does not hesitate to encourage and support secessionist and revengeful forces seeking to damage the political and territorial integrity and inviolability of borders of some Asian states. It was with Chinese support that the separatists forces in Burma and India carried on their treasonable activities. China openly encourages those circles in Japan which lay claims to the so-called "northern territories". In other words, China is trying to revise the borders of Japan established after World War II.

Today the majority of Asian states support the principle of inviolability of borders which have historically been shaped in the continent they also support the principle of inadmissibility of annexing territory through aggression. The conviction is deepening that the settlement of territorial disputes can and must be carried out by peaceful means and through negotiations and there are plenty of examples to show the effectiveness of this method.

While analysing all kinds of encroachments upon the national sovereignty of Asian nations it is necessary to stress that the forces of imperialism and reaction have been invariably seeking to enslave economically by using neo-colonial forms and methods. A specially important role is assigned to international monopolies which imperialists use with the purpose of plunderously exploiting the natural wealth and resources of Asia's developing countries and of opposing their socio-economic transformations. The inequitable economic agreements imposed on Asian states continue to serve as an effective instrument of enslaving them.

From year to year the developing countries of Asia uphold their economic independence ever more vigorously and make an increasingly wide use of their sovereign rights and state power in order to repulse the arbitrary acts of foreign capital. Young Asian states seek recognition and strict observance by foreign capital of the principle of mutual benefit and begin applying radical measures to protect their interests including nationalisation of foreign property.

The struggle to establish the principle of respect for national sovereignty waged by independent states by national liberation movements and by all democratic and progressive forces in Asia is gaining strength and scope.

Non interference in internal affairs. The obligation of states not to interfere in internal affairs of other countries following the principle of respect for sovereignty of nations and states is a fundamental feature of present-day

international law an important condition of peaceful co existence of states with different social systems The UN Charter regards the principle of non interference as one of the most important principles of the world body It has been confirmed by the UN Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty (1965) and the UN declaration on the principles of friendly relations (1970)

The principle of non interference cannot be construed to mean merely the banning of threat or use of force It also means the renunciation of use of political economic and other measures and all forms of interference in the internal affairs of states in order to restrict their sovereign rights and gain advantages whatever they might be at the expense of other states Proceeding from a broader interpretation of the principle of non interference the UN Declaration of 1965 emphasised its fairly important component when it said that all states shall refrain from organising assisting training financing encouraging or allowing armed subversive or terrorist activities directed at changing the system of another state by means of violence and also refrain from interfering in internal struggle in another state Thus the principle of non interference rules out both export of counter revolution as well as revolution Establishing social systems and choosing forms of government are a prerogative of the countries themselves

However in Asia perhaps as nowhere else the principle of non interference in internal affairs is being often violated grossly Imperialism and reaction continue to make attempts at imposing their will on independent countries and at suppressing national liberation movements in Asia By its unscrupulous interference in the internal affairs of many Asian nations the Peking leaders have more than once

exacerbated the situation, thereby threatening peace and security in Asia

Asian countries and peoples, as well as peoples elsewhere are giving an ever more resolute rebuff to the interference in their internal affairs by imperialists and their henchmen and are ever more actively seeking to introduce the principle of non interference in the practice of international relations. This was reflected in the Declaration of the Conference of Non Aligned Countries in Algiers (1973), which demanded elimination of any kind of interference or pressure—political, economic or military.

The broad development of economic and other cooperation on the basis of complete equality and mutual advantage although conducted on a voluntary basis is invariably becoming a legal norm an obligatory principle. This is pre-determined in particular by the fact that bilateral and multilateral cooperation between states in economic social cultural scientific and technological and other spheres provided all basic standards of international law, and the principles of respect for sovereignty and non interference are observed which bring countries and peoples closer together promotes mutual understanding and trust between them thereby offering broader opportunities for consolidating universal peace

Taking into account the important role played by such cooperation in maintaining international security all states are naturally expected to promote it in every possible way. The present day detente objectively gives rise to favourable conditions for achieving this goal. At the same time considerable difficulties arising from the negative consequences of the energy and raw material crises currency upheavals and unprecedented inflation that have struck the capitalist world hinder the path of progress of economic trade scientific technological and cultural ties among states

It is necessary to emphasise here the significance of such

inalienable components of the principle of economic and other cooperation of states as complete equality and mutual benefit. They rule out every kind of discrimination in relations between countries whatever the differences in their political, economic and social systems or the level of economic development. As for specific forms of cooperation, they are being chosen by states themselves, subject to their needs and material resources, domestic legislation and international commitments.

The principle of economic and other cooperation has been reaffirmed in the UN Charter, the UN declaration on the principles of friendly relations, and in other authoritative international documents, including the recent ones, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Programme of Action adopted in 1974 by the Sixth special Session of the UN General Assembly on problems of raw materials and development.

The people and countries of Asia are facing tremendous urgent tasks of socio-economic development. Their solution depends not only on their own effort but largely on an all round cooperation among them.

Asian states are attaching increasing importance to the development of economic trade and cultural ties with the Soviet Union and with other Socialist countries. This will enable them to wage a more successful struggle against the imperialists' attempts to enslave them as well as for their economic independence and social progress.

The Soviet Union, which has been advocating cooperation with Asian countries and has been unfailingly giving them considerable assistance in overcoming backwardness and oppression, continues to give them support in the building of the core sector of national economy, in particular in creating an industrial basis of their economies.

Experience shows the people of Asia that large-scale development of equitable and mutually advantageous co-

operation enables them to channel the maximum of their resources into production, to use in the interests of their own progress the achievements of scientific and technological revolution and the advantages of the division of labour in Asia and on the world scale. And all this is possible only if there exist good neighbourly relations and durable peace, which can develop on the basis of collective security in Asia.

It is obvious, therefore, that the foundations of collective security in Asia are in full conformity with the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, principles written in the UN Charter, principles in the historic declaration of the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian countries (1955) and other international documents which have a bearing on Asia.

Setting forth the idea of ensuring peace in Asia by joint effort, we start from the premise that, as a result of its implementation, a reliable collective security for all Asia will come into being, that it will be open to all Asian states, that no country will obtain any one-sided advantage at the expense of other states, that they will all live in conditions of equal security, and that collective security itself will not be directed against any one Asian country or a group of Asian countries.

As the hotbed of war in Southeast Asia has already been eliminated, the idea of establishing collective security which has become much more possible, is received in Asia with growing understanding and approval. The broadest sections of Asian people are demonstrating their support to this idea. Even more Asian states, including India, which is playing a most important role in shaping the destiny of the continent, and many others, came out in support of a collective defence of peace in Asia. Today the question at issue is to start translating this just and noble ideal into reality.

A distinguishing feature of the proposal for collective security is that it takes into account the real situations in

Asia and the demands of the times. Extensive development of economic and other kinds of cooperation will make it possible to provide the necessary material basis for Asian security.

The principles of Asian security on a collective basis pave the way for introducing principles in inter-state relations that will ultimately enable the policy of peaceful co-existence to gain acceptance throughout the Asian continent. Though mainly these principles correspond to those embodied in the UN Charter, they are not a repetition but further development to them. Moreover, as everyone knows, not all Asian states are in the UN.

Owing to its very nature, collective security cannot but be of an all Asian nature. The starting point for the establishment of collective security in Asia is the indivisibility of peace, i.e., the organic interconnection of universal security and the security of each individual state. All states in that region irrespective of differences in their social system, will work for establishment of collective security which would be in the interests of each state.

The Soviet Union's initiative in establishing Asian security has evoked wide response and support both in and outside the continent. Imperialism and international reaction are trying to retaliate with a counter attack but they have very little chance of succeeding. The drive for ensuring security on the basis of collective efforts of Asian states is becoming an effective factor in Asia's political affairs.

The line of demarcation between the two opposing forces in Asia is easy to follow. Whereas the champions of collective security seek lasting peace and beneficial cooperation, their opponents cannot conceive of Asia without blocs without further aggravation of tension and without Asian states being at loggerheads with one another.

True, taking into account the trend for detente, imperialism and reaction do not always act in the open and

often try underhand means. Let us take a closer look at the moves of the opponents of collective security in Asia.

A deliberate attempt is made to artificially exaggerate the complexity of Asian reality and, thereby, to question the validity of the idea of collective security in Asia. The *London Times* (March 22, 1972) claims that "the totally undefined concept of an Asian collective security arrangement is not an adequate policy to cope with such a complex situation."

One cannot fail to see how biased this and other such allegations are. Nobody denies that it will take time and effort to establish security in Asia.

The supporters of collective security take into consideration the real state of affairs in Asia, the different levels of development, the mixed character of social relations in the states in that area, the differences in national traditions, language and culture.

However, it is one thing to recognise the complexity of the Asian situation and another to deny, on these grounds, the need for pooling the efforts of Asian states in the interests of security and cooperation. It is the latter, unseemingly guideline that the opponents of collective security lay down. Certain Western experts, in general, call into question the possibility of Asian unity itself.

The intensified quest for ways of developing regional cooperation and collective defence of peace in Asia elucidates the far-fetched nature of doubts of this kind. Furthermore, consideration of the real situation in Asia does not remove, but, on the contrary, increases the need for urgent, joint efforts to bring about a decisive change in Asian affairs towards general normalisation.

The opponents of Asian collective security seek to distort the meaning of the Soviet Union's intention of setting up blocs and its "hostile designs" with regard to certain Asian countries. For example, Cyrus Sulzberger, well

known US political commentator, alleges that the idea is to establish an Asian bloc favourable to the Kremlin and to by pass China from the southern flank

It is easy to see how groundless such allegations are. There is no mention in the Soviet proposals about setting up some kind of a "bloc". These proposals only lay down the principles for Asian states, including respect for their sovereign rights and a wide range of measures for developing multiform cooperation among Asian countries in full accordance with their vital requirements.

It would be useful to recall here that there was a time when the People's Republic of China fully supported the Soviet Union's stand on the question of Asian collective security. The joint Soviet Chinese statement signed on January 18, 1957 stated:

"Both sides consider that all closed military groupings should be replaced by a system of collective peace and collective security."

Furthermore, during the 1955-60 period, the government of People's Republic of China itself on more than one occasion advanced the proposal of conclusion of a peace treaty between Asian and Pacific countries including the United States and also a non aggression treaty in that area.

Facts reject the false premises of the opponents of the idea of collective security. "The idea of collective security for Asia" Nikolai Podgorny, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet emphasised at a dinner given by President Cevdet Sunay of the Turkish Republic in April 1972 "is not aimed against any state. Its sole purpose is to transform Asian into a continent of peace and cooperation."

The Soviet Union emphasises that all Asian countries including the People's Republic of China will become equal participants in the system of collective security in Asia.

An increasing demand is today being made that detente

should not remain confined to Europe, that the spirit of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should govern Asian events as well. We all know that this cannot be achieved in one go. It is a continuous and long process in which all interested countries are to take part on the basis of equality. The edifice of such a security system cannot be "bought" or "lent". It is to be "built" by the Asians, brick by brick, by using the local 'building material' with the 'labour' of all states of the region.

The very process of 'building,' i.e., exchange of opinion and ideas and the seeking of ways and solutions, would help bring about a better understanding between Asian states, create an atmosphere of stronger confidence and establish closer cooperation.

It should be stated here that the idea of setting up such a system of relations in Asia had long been 'in the air' of the continent. Many ideas advanced by Asian countries in the past few decades have been directed towards finding a joint, common body of principles and forms of collective security and ways of implementing them. Asia actually was 'far ahead' of Europe inasmuch as it had formulated the well known ten principles of peaceful coexistence back in 1955 at Bandung. The Asian countries had then put forward the principle of promoting cooperation because they had realised that cooperation would serve as a groundwork for strengthening confidence and mutual understanding for peace and stability.

During the visit of L.I. Brezhnev to India in 1973, which led to the signing of the historic Joint Declaration by him and Mrs. Indira Gandhi and other documents of Indo-Soviet friendship and cooperation, the Soviet leader, in his address to the Parliament, gave an exposition of the Soviet proposal of Asian collective security, explained its closeness to the Bandung principles and called for joint efforts to evolve a common approach.

In Asian countries, confidence is growing in the feasibility of achieving a lasting peace and creating a stable situation here, favourable for concentrating the efforts of these countries on the present-day tasks of their internal development. The search is being intensified for practical ways and concrete measures, both partial and general, which would be conducive to promoting and strengthening the security of Asian states. It is on these problems that the thinking of the Asian public is concentrated and we believe this to be a major achievement.

"No small number of interesting initiatives are emerging inspired by a concern for Asia's peaceful future, such as the idea of the neutralisation of South East Asia, the search for such a formula for relations between South Asian states as would ensure good neighbourly cooperation between them, the proposal to turn the Indian Ocean into a Zone of peace and plans for regional cooperation.

CHAPTER XII

Enemies of Non-Alignment

In spite of provocations, the non-alignment movement has not allowed its foundations to be weakened nor its principles to be diluted. It is pertinent here to examine the role, China has played in relation to this movement of the Third World to which this Asian country claims to belong.

Does China support the movement wholeheartedly? Or, does its global strategy come into conflict with the programme of action of the non-aligned group? A verbal expression of sympathy with one non-aligned conference or the other is not a proof of active partisanship for and involvement with this powerful world wide movement. What determines a country's posture in relation to it is the active stand it takes vis-a-vis the entire body of its principles based on implacable opposition to imperialism, colonialism and war, to "blocc politics," to continued US presence in Asia, to collective peace in the continent, above all, to the outbreak of a nuclear global confrontation.

China is known for its mock heroics against imperialism which it has the temerity of calling a "paper tiger" despite the fact that it has dug its ferocious teeth into the body-politic of Asia, making it bleed profusely—to death in the numerous hamlets and towns of Vietnam, to rendering the Vietnamese men and women, old and young, crippled for

life What is China's "anti imperialism" worth when its leaders have gone on record expressing themselves for continued presence in Asia of the very United States of America which turned Vietnam into a testing ground for its highly sophisticated weapons of war, which pressed into service every conceivable achievement of modern technology for subjugating and conquering the Vietnamese people and which, in return, got a devastating kick which it finds hard to forget This is a fact recorded against China, not by its enemies, but by its new fangled friend—the USA Joseph Alsop frankly declared in *The Washington Post*, after analysing the motives behind Dr Henry Kissinger's latest visit to China

'Hence the highly significant seeming transformation of Peking's view about the US role in Asia Without saying much about it, the leaders in Peking positively appear to favour a continued US military presence in South East Asia They even appear to think that the Japanese American Security Treaty is on the whole advantageous "

Cyrus Sulzberger noted in *The New York Herald Tribune* that gradually one and the same feature has been characterising the US and Chinese policies *The Financial Express* has advanced the idea that the Sino-US agreement is that Peking and Washington have many common interests in the Western part of the Pacific

Why this special feeling for the deadliest foe of Asian people, of the entire non aligned world? Why this attempt to hug him to bosom?

The Third World today is familiar with the transformation in China's stand from anti imperialism to open support to the US and its allies in Western Europe This turn about dates back to its breakaway from the community of developing countries, from the community of the socialist states Facts are too well known to be falsified by Peking historians

China's blind anti Sovietism has logically brought it

into a tight embrace with the US. Peking has virtually folded up its anti-US stance, entered into a pact with it against the very interests of Third World countries. Why else would its sympathies extend, as if by a reflex action, to Washington-propped butcher, Yahya Khan, who plunged East Pakistan into a blood bath? Why else would China enter into a pact with Pakistan against India, the same Pakistan which as a member of the CENTO has played imperialism's game in the subcontinent?

During the "cultural revolution" China stepped up its hostility towards the socialist countries, while criticism of imperialism abated. The 9th and especially the 10th Congress of the Chinese Communist party completed the swing towards the struggle on one front—against the USSR.

As the "cultural revolution" was fading out, the search was intensified for ways of normalising relations with the imperialist countries—the USA, Japan and West European powers, and Peking's resistance to detente increased. Its stand coalesced with that of imperialist forces, not only in terms of governmental policy, but also in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism.

There has been an approximation in China's position and those of certain quarters in the USA on a number of international problems. This is seen in its resistance to the calling of a world conference on disarmament, in the negative approach to any consideration in the United Nations of the question of non use of force in international relations, prohibition of use of nuclear weapons for all time and to the adoption of measures to consolidate international security, etc. In the recent period, the similarity of approach by Peking and Washington to various regional problems—assessment of the role of NATO, CENTO and other military blocs, and the problems of Indo-China and the Indian subcontinent—is ever more pronounced. *The Chinese propaganda*

and official spokesmen have come out for maintaining the US military presence in Europe apart from Asia

The Chinese US summit talks paved the way for development, not only of political, but also of economic and other contacts between the two countries. In May 1973, a US liaison mission was set up in Peking, and a similar Chinese mission was later set up in Washington. The Chinese, according to Henry Kissinger, chose this form of maintaining inter governmental relations themselves as one of the forms proposed to them in February 1972. By agreeing to set up the Chinese liaison mission in Washington where there is an "embassy of the Chinese Republic" (Taiwan) Peking has departed from its "firm" and "principled" stand on Taiwan in effect, tacitly recognising the "two-Chinas" concept, which it had so demonstratively rejected for many years.

Peking feels irked at the fact that the overseas visitors who had but recently been delighted with everything they saw in China's restaurants and markets have now begun to notice for instance the struggle for power going on within the Chinese ruling elite, and the grave political crisis and economic slump the country has been going through. Peking would like the USA to return to cold war, but there is awareness in Washington that this would run counter to the US national interests in the first place. US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told *Newsweek* in December 1974 that relations between the USA and China were relations of practical necessity when the two countries decided to cooperate in order to attain limited goals.

China has looked upon its relations with Western Europe through the prism of anti Sovietism. Its approach to Western Europe is based on the belief that it can be regarded as a reserve in the fight against the Soviet Union. In an effort to maintain tensions in Europe which could spark off a third world war Mao and his group would like to see Europe an area not of detente but of "vast upheavals" as a

continued state in relations between the West European countries and the USA, on the one hand, and the socialist countries, on the other. China urges West Europe and the USA to step up their military efforts against the socialist community. For that purpose, extensive use has been made of the tactics of pressurising West European opinion with the imaginary threat "from the north". The *International Herald Tribune* stated that Peking was inclined to support the far reaching goal of seeing an European nuclear force established. The *Hsinhua* Agency advised the NATO member states 'to be capable jointly of deterring the Warsaw Treaty Organisation from any reckless or provocative acts'.

Peking's blistering attacks on any practical moves made by European states to establish principles and forms of co-operation on the continent are also highly indicative. The Chinese press looked at the historic Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe as a futile exercise, and it ignored the positive advances made in tackling a number of problems.

China has shown great zeal in advocating NATO's build up, assuming that this is the "most reliable way" of maintaining the arms race in Europe and of checkmating the 'growing Soviet influence'. Together with revenge-seekers in West Germany, Peking has criticised the principle of immutability of borders and opposed the treaties signed by the FRG with the USSR and with other socialist countries, because it hates to see territorial problems settled as they were in Europe.

Peking has also radically changed its approach to economic integration in Western Europe. It now wants to see the EEC enlarged and consolidated. The *Times* (November 21, 1975) noted that such an interest in EEC's programme has emerged 'not so much because of its possibilities as a big trading partner, as for its usefulness as a political counterweight against the Soviet Union'.

West European economic integration is regarded in Peking as an alternative to all European co-operation and as an important premise for the establishment of a Western Europe integrated in political and military terms and ranged against the socialist community. No wonder the Chinese leaders' approach to the EEC has fully coincided with the plans of the most reactionary forces in the West.

In the hope of achieving their notorious great power aspirations the Chinese leaders have stubbornly opposed any step away from war and have advocated violence actively provoking steps aggravating the international situation. They declare that every generation must have its own war that the present world situation is still marked by vast upheavals which keep mounting making another world war inevitable.

That is why Peking has joined hands with Strauss and other West German ultras in fighting the idea of a collective security system in Europe that is why it has denounced the idea of stronger security in Asia through collective efforts by all Asian countries that is why it would welcome another war in the Middle East and that is why it tried to prevent any normalisation in Indo-China and sought to undermine the UN Charter. The Chinese leaders believe that peaceful co-existence is useful only when it helps lull the adversaries vigilance or gain some advantages at the expense of other.

Peking has not signed one single international agreement aimed at detente and stronger international security. At the UN General Assembly sessions the Chinese delegates oppose the definition of aggression worked out within the UN framework and are unsparing in their efforts to denigrate the proposals designed to contain the arms race, promote detente, establish the principles of peaceful coexistence and strengthen international security.

All this enables us to evaluate the role China has been playing in relation to the principles the non-aligned group have been steadfastly carrying out individually in the con-

duct of their foreign policies and collectively in their summit gatherings—from Belgrade to Algiers—and at their last Foreign Ministers' Conference in Lima

The objective the non alignment movement has set itself from its very inception is one of achieving international relaxation to facilitate the triumph of the cause of world peace so dear to Nehru, Nasser and Soekarno. Peking not only opposes and hampers relaxation in tension but is trying to make the Third World believe that the worsening of international situation and another world war resulting from it would be in its interests, since "great disorder" would supposedly lead to a "world revolution". Understanding full well the monstrous and inhuman essence of this course, the non-aligned countries reject it.

The Algiers conference firmly stated that the process of detente should continue. Detente creates the most favourable conditions for the struggle of national liberation and anti-imperialist forces. The Lima Declaration specially called for the deepening of detente and for extending it to all parts of the world since relaxation of international tension now under way, creates favourable conditions for resolving problems stemming from cold war and also those stemming from nuclear confrontation, with all its disastrous consequences.

Speaking about the two entirely different approaches towards detente—of China and of the non aligned movement—one cannot but recall the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe the attitude to which has been aptly called "the test" of understanding the process of relaxation of tension. It is common knowledge that Peking belittles "the spirit of Helsinki" in every possible way. In Lima, on the other hand, the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries unanimously noted that the splendid results of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation should exert a favourable influence on the solution of pro-

blems inherited from the cold war and other international problems

China refuses to participate in anything that would promote the strengthening of peace and security and further the process of relaxation of tension. This is particularly obvious with regard to the Middle East problem. The non aligned countries have invariably blamed Israel for the continuing Middle East crisis and denounced the USA for the support it is giving it. They have stressed time and again that a just and durable peace in that area can be achieved only if two main conditions are fulfilled: immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories and satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. China however, does not want to promote the settlement of the Arab states following the policy of non alignment.

Let us take the crucial issue of disarmament. The position of the non aligned countries is quite clear in this respect. They have repeatedly come out in favour of steps aimed at ending the arms race. Both in Algiers and in Lima they urged the convening of a world disarmament conference originally proposed by the Soviet Union. In Lima the Foreign Ministers pointed out that the arms race jeopardises peace and security, in particular the security of the non aligned and other developing states. They took the decision, which was incorporated in the Lima Declaration, to coordinate the activities of the countries to promote the convening of such a conference in the shortest period of time. Peking, on the other hand, invented a strange doctrine, to say the least. According to this doctrine partial or gradual measures aimed at reducing the armaments and armed forces are "deception of peoples". It insisted on something impossible (knowing it to be impossible) an immediate general and complete disarmament. Meanwhile the Chinese would like even the developing countries to constantly strengthen and build up

their military might, as China is doing. Naturally China denounces the very ideal of a world disarmament conference. In the last, 30th jubilee session of the UN General Assembly the Chinese delegation again fiercely opposed all disarmament measures and openly advocated war.

The course of events has shown that China brazenly violates another basic principle of non alignment. Specifically it collaborates with aggressive blocs, going to the extent of buying from the NATO countries the latest types of weapons and technology in order to build up its nuclear rocket potential. China allies itself with the fascist junta in Chile and with racist regimes in Africa which have been unanimously condemned by the non aligned movement. The non aligned countries have invariably come out for the unconditional liquidation of all war bases and against the military presence of imperialism in general. Thus the Lima conference denounced the building of a base in Diego Garcia. The non aligned countries favour the establishment of zones in the world free of nuclear and other weapons. The present Chinese leaders far from supporting this stand of the non aligned movement directly oppose it in words and deeds. Not satisfied with tacitly approving the turning of Diego Garcia into a military outpost of imperialism in the Indian Ocean the top Chinese leaders have repeatedly and openly stated that they welcome the imperialist military presence in Asia.

Despite all this, China calls itself an exponent of the aspirations of the Third World! It is appropriate to recall here an ancient Chinese saying 'Listen to the words but watch the deeds.'

Nothing shocked the non aligned world more than Mao's flow of sympathy towards Pinochet, the hangman of Chile whose democratically elected government headed by President Salvador Allende was overthrown by brutal murder sending a wave of shock and horror all over the world. A few days before his martyrdom President Allende had sent

his personal greetings to the Algiers non aligned summit. The great Chilean patriot had stated

"The countries of this area (Latin America) understand that their future rests upon the liquidation of all forms of economic dependence dictated from the outside. They also understand that it is essential to participate more and more actively and directly, together with other developing countries in the matter of consolidating universal peace, in the struggle to liquidate colonialism, racialism and discrimination, in the transformation of the entire structure of economic and trade relations between the world of abundance and the world of poverty and need, and in the establishment of a just and humane international division of labour in the interests of the overwhelming majority of nations."

Did not Mao read this message? Then why on the morrow of Allende's murder did his heart overflow with love for the Chilean fascist junta?

Did not Mao know as the *New York Times* had revealed of the credit blockade the US had organised to choke Chile to surrender to reaction?

Did not Mao hear the warning given by the *Economist* that 'if the Right is hoping to stage a comeback, it will have to look outside the constitutional framework'?

Did not Mao know, as Nancy Phelan stated in her book *The Chilean Way*, that Allende had only six years the term of his presidency in which he had to repair the wrongs of 400 years?

Did not Mao know that fascism gave this great Chilean democrat not even full three years to bring his democratic programme to fruition?

Then why at all did Mao bless the "pro-slavery" rebellion in Chile by agreeing to sell arms to Pinochet? A facsimile of the letter sent by the Chinese embassy in Chile

to the junta on the sale of arms to hangman Pinochet has been published the world over. Its contents, first revealed by the Peruvian paper *Express*, filled the people of the non-aligned group with disgust and revulsion.

Let us now take the question of South Africa and Angola. Peking's role here is even more shamefaced. We all remember that historic day when the UN Security Council approved a resolution strongly condemning the South African Republic's armed invasion of the People's Republic of Angola. We also remember that shameful moment when the Chinese delegate refused to support it and abstained from voting though it was passed by a majority vote.

The Chinese delegate's stand was not accidental. Ever since the armed conflict in Angola began, the Maoist leadership had been siding with forces of neo-colonialism and racialism which had tried, through invasion, to preserve Angola as a bulwark of imperialism in its struggle against Africa's progressive forces. These schemes failed, and the enormous sums of money spent by Angola's enemies including Peking, to finance arms supplies and recruitment of mercenaries were thus wasted away.

Peking, relying on neo-colonialists and racialist, found itself in isolation from the non-aligned world. The debate in the Security Council on the invasion of Angola showed that China's unseemingly stand was obvious both to the developing and many other countries, whose news media stressed the infamous part played by the Maoist in the developments in Africa and around it. Peking's treacherous policy with regard to the Angolan people demonstrated to the non-aligned world the enormous gap between its words and deeds.

The disservice the Chinese leadership has done to the non-alignment movement is also seen the way it has tried to equate its genuine friend, the USSR, with its old detractor and enemy, the USA. Peking has made attempts to draw

a parallel between the policies of the USSR and the USA by advancing the spurious theory of "super powers" While the Algiers Conference of non aligned countries was in session, debating the problems of struggle against imperialism, the Chinese leadership beamed to it its pet tenets of the theory of "super powers"

The non aligned delegates at the Algiers conference nailed down this "theory" for all it was worth and explained the real motive lying behind its "authors" who were enjoying the tacit approval of the USA. It was Fidel Castro who smashed the false "theory" so obligingly passed on to certain delegates by the forces of international reaction. His speech made it clear who were the genuine allies of the developing countries in the struggle against imperialism "At this conference," Fidel Castro declared "various forms of dividing up the world have been discussed. For us the world is divided into capitalist and socialist countries, into colonialist and colonised countries into reactionary and progressive countries as well as into governments which support imperialism, colonialism neo-colonialism and racism and governments which struggle against imperialism colonialism neo colonialism and racism "

Castro told the Conference about the enormous and selfless aid which the Soviet Union has offered and continues to offer to the peoples national liberation movements. He added

"Any attempts to force a collusion between the non aligned countries and the socialist camp is profoundly counter revolutionary and serves exclusively the interests of imperialism. Inventing an imaginary enemy pursues only one end the avoiding of the real enemy. To deprive us of friendship with the socialist camp means to weaken us and to leave us at the mercy of the still powerful forces of imperialism. This would be narrow minded strategy and unforgivable political short-sightedness.

It should be added that Fidel Castro's speech, received with stormy applause, had an enormous impact on the participants in the conference and was an important turning point in its work. Other delegates also noted the overriding importance of cooperation with the socialist community.

Nguyen Huu Tho, the Chairman of the then Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, declared

"There is yet one other, no less important factor—the alliance between the non aligned and the socialist countries as well as all other anti imperialist and anti colonialist countries and forces."

Salem Ali Rubayyi, head of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, also gave a firm rebuff to the attempts to cut off the movement of the non aligned countries from the socialist countries and appealed for an 'alliance between the non aligned nations and the socialist camp, without which it will be impossible to succeed in the struggle against imperialism'.

This position, the only correct one, was also upheld by the great leader of Bangladesh Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. He remarked 'The term Third World must not allow us to forget basic realities. The world is divided into the oppressors and the oppressed. I would like to declare very clearly that we stand for solidarity among the progressive forces of the world. We are on the side of the oppressed and of those who support their just struggle for liberation'.

Commenting on this discussion at the conference, the Bangladesh newspaper *People* stated that non alignment must signify something more than simple refusal to ally. It must have a positive meaning. Non alignment in the name of what? Fidel Castro offered a simple and correct answer in the name of socialism. If this is understood there will be less confusion at future conferences.

Soon after the conference Marien Ngouabi, head of the People's Republic of the Congo, declared "The Congo is a friend of the Soviet Union and will not place on the same level the Soviet Union and the United States "

President Boumedienne noted, among other things, at the concluding session that in the struggle for national liberation the Third World countries derived their strength from the very existence of the camp of socialist countries and also from the support of progressive forces all over the world

"The October Revolution and the changes which it brought about in the balance of powers in the world made a historic contribution to the creation of favourable conditions and to ensuring the success of the struggle for national independence waged by the countries which had fallen under imperialist dominance "

The principle of cooperation with the socialist nations was expressed in the resolutions which were worked out in the commissions parallel with the general discussion among the heads of state and government

This was entirely a logical development The overwhelming majority of delegates at the Algiers non-aligned summit looked with surprise and expressed resentment at the actions of those who tried to obstruct cooperation between the non-aligned countries and the socialist community After all, the participants in the conference were well aware of the building of the great Aswan and Euphrates dams, the metallurgical complex in Bhilai and hundreds of other mills, workshops and installations in Asia, Africa and Latin America with the assistance of socialist countries They remembered the aid given by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to revolutionary Cuba to fighting Vietnam, to the awakened Arab nations and to the growing national liberation movement in Africa They kept in mind the unwavering political support socialist countries were giving to the just struggles of the developing countries against imperialism All

this demonstrates conclusively that the socialist countries are truly interested in the development and consolidation of the progressive independent states of Africa, Asia and Latin America struggling against imperialism for they constitute an inseparable part of the general front of the world progressive forces fighting for social justice, peace and security of nations

The fact that this was correctly evaluated by an overwhelming majority of the participants in the Algiers conference speaks well of the future of the non alignment movement. The conference affirmed that the fundamental goals of the movement—*struggle for peace and against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racialism and zionism, in alliance with the world's progressive forces—remain unchanged*

The Maoist theory of "two super powers" has for its basis the Kissinger's "balance-of-power" concept in international politics. The "power" theory, which views the world community as an aggregate of states whose foreign policies have nothing to do with their social system and which regard the principle of force and dominations of nations on its basis as the cardinal principle of international relations, was further developed by the Peking leadership into the false concept of two "super powers" in "rivalry and collusion" with each other. The Western historians and political scientists characterise the post-war years as the "era of Soviet American domination" in world politics. True, the post war decades were a period when the United States held indisputable sway over the Western world and dominated a wide zone of countries dependent upon imperialism. It is also true that the Soviet Union on account of its great experience in building socialism and its economic potential and military strength, played a prominent role in the development of the socialist system and served as the mainstay of support for the liberation movements as well as the main

source for their inspiration. But Western writers lump together the use of resources and power in two entirely different directions under the same term of "domination". They put the USA and the USSR on the same level equating the US presence in Western Europe and other areas of the world which ensured the flow of huge profits to the American monopolies with Soviet cooperation with European and Asian socialist and developing states on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

The Maoists go even a step further and accuse the USSR of "collusion" with the USA. Whereas Western commentators make allegations about each of the two "super powers" "dominating" its part of the world, Peking cries hoarse about a global 'condominium' of two "super powers".

The concept of "rivalry and collusion of two super powers" is in fact, nothing but an ideological diversion aimed at slandering the foreign policy of the socialist countries distorting the substance of international detente and subverting it, and pitting the Third World War and the world socialist camp against each other.

The recent agreement between the USSR and the USA on the prevention of nuclear war is aimed at safeguarding the world against the hazards of the devastating war. In fact the agreement represents the fulfilment of an important item of programme of non aligned nations which have been in the forefront of the world wide struggle for removing threat of nuclear war.

In the Moscow document on the basic principles of relations between the USSR and the USA it was also made clear that the two powers "made no claims for themselves to any special rights or advantages in world affairs".

The Soviet initiative in effecting a transition from cold war confrontation to cooperation among states with different social systems does not mean however, cessation of com

petition between the two social systems. As Leonid Brezhnev stressed in his address at the 25th Congress

"The CPSU has always held and now holds that the class struggle between the two systems will continue but we shall strive to shift this historically inevitable struggle onto a path free from the perils of war, of dangerous conflicts and an uncontrolled arms race "

The acceptance of the principles of peaceful coexistence as a norm of behaviour between the USSR and the USA will only help in creating favourable conditions for the struggle of the emerging nations against neo colonialism in all its forms. A transition from military confrontation to peaceful cooperation will facilitate the task of the forces of national liberation by reducing the danger of external intervention

The Maoist concept of "rivalry and collusion of two super powers" has failed to gain credence among the countries of the Third World. The repeated pronouncements by the Maoists that China would never become a super power and their hypocritical declarations of solidarity with the "small" and "medium" powers are not taken seriously by the peoples of the Third World who have by now acquired enough experience of the Chinese behaviour in international affairs. They know what exactly lies behind the attempts made by China to place the USSR and the USA at par, they fully understand that the slogan of struggle against the "two super powers" under the stewardship of China is aimed against world socialism, a dependable ally of the Third World

As we stated earlier, the Algiers conference rejected the Maoist-oriented approach of placing the Soviet Union and the USA in the same category as "two super powers". The decisions taken by the conference demonstrated a clear-cut anti imperialist trend. Fidel Castro summed up everyone's feelings when he declared

'How can one call the Soviet Union an imperialist power? Where are its monopolies? Where is its participation in multinational companies? Where industries, mines, oilfields does it own in the developing world? Where worker is exploited by Soviet capital in any country of Asia, Africa and Latin America? Without the October Revolution, without the immortal feat of the Soviet people which was the first to withstand imperialist intervention and blockade and which later repelled and routed the fascist aggressor at the sacrifice of 20 million human lives and which developed its technology and economy at the cost of unprecedented efforts and heroism without exploiting the labour of a single worker in any country of the world, the elimination of colonialism, or the establishment of such a correlation of world forces that facilitates the heroic struggle of so many peoples for their emancipation, would have been absolutely impossible."

The Cuban leader told the non aligned conference that "any attempt to pit the non aligned countries against the socialist camp is profoundly counter revolutionary and is aimed at safeguarding the interests of imperialism." He added

"The world is divided into capitalist and socialist countries and governments, into those supporting imperialism, colonialism and racism, and those opposing them. The theory of two 'imperialisms' being spread by the ideologists of capitalism is totally false and is designed to split the non aligned countries."

The Chinese theory of 'super powers' found an echo in the articles of Egyptian journalist Heikal after his trip to Peking. Commenting on these write ups, the Nida of Lebanon said in March, 1973

"The Arab countries' experience is the best evidence of the falsehood of notorious Chinese statements retold by

Heikal Soviet policy is based on selfless assistance, mutual advantage and constant support for the progress of the young states, and there are hundreds of examples to prove this. What have the Chinese done for their part?"

It is worth noticing here that the Chinese-American Joint Communiqué issued after President Nixon's visit to Peking (February 21-28, 1972) said that the progress towards normalisation of relations between China and the US was in the interests of all states. Why, then, is progress towards normalisation of relations between the USSR and the USA declared by Maoists as a "deal"? As President Assad of Syria told the *Al-Thawrah* correspondent in September 1973

"The relaxation of tension in the world as a whole and in relation between the two Great Powers has been of the utmost importance in changing the international situation. This was signified, in particular, by the end of the cold-war stage and the pursuit of a new line aimed at disarmament, prohibition of nuclear tests and the establishment of a definite form of peaceful coexistence between the Great Powers."

Under the heading "We Do Not Equate the USSR and the USA", *Al-Thawrah* quoted President Assad to have declared

"We should like to reaffirm that this does not in any sense mean that we agree with those who say that the USSR and the USA have drawn closer to each other and have ranged themselves against the other nations. This view is totally unacceptable. The USSR has always stood on the side of the people fighting for freedom, independence and progress. As for the USA, it has invariably taken a hostile attitude to the peoples, to their freedom and progress. In the light of this truth it is inadmissible and impossible to put both these states on the same footing."

The Egyptian paper *Al-Gomhouriya* observed

"In dealing with the Soviet Union and the USA as great powers, different criteria should be used. To take the same attitude to these two countries is to start out by making a mistake. It is patent ignorance to make analogies between them as 'Great Powers'."

In a radio and television broadcast on January 25, 1973, President Ngouabig of the People's Republic of the Congo declared

"When some speak of the hegemony of the super powers, they imply condemnation of the Soviet Union which is put on the same footing as the USA. It is well known, however, that the USA alone is an imperialist power seeking to establish its hegemony."

In an attempt to confuse the non-aligned group and to sidetrack their main attention from exposing imperialism, China also gave currency to the Western doctrine of "rich" and "poor" nations. The doctrine outright rejected the well known fact that the poverty of Third World countries was historically conditioned by its long subjection to colonialism. The doctrine lumped, in the category of "rich" nations, both those which belonged to the imperialist camp and those of the socialist community. A prominent Western economist, S. Frankal, for instance, denied outright the fact that imperialist powers were exploiting colonial peoples. He declared futile all attempts at counting the balance of income and losses in relations between the colonies and parent countries (*In Defence of Colonies*, London, p. 5).

Since the early sixties of the present century, the advocates of the Western doctrine of "rich" and "poor" nations have received unexpected support from Peking. As early as the fifties, Mao Tse tung proclaimed the hegemonistic slogan "The East Wind Prevails Over the West Wind." Utilising this slogan, Chinese leaders tried to minimise the role of the world socialist system—the ally of the Third World—and

to replace the social and economic approach to one based on geography and racial characteristics. China's artificial division of the world into "East" and "West" approximates the imperialist concept of "satisfied North" and "hungry South." Peking has no compunction to lump both the socialist Soviet Union and imperialist USA together under the blanket category of 'rich nations.' What else motive is there except to lull the genuine anti-imperialist vigilance of the non-aligned, to make them turn away from their sworn enemy, imperialism, with which Mao has entered into an unholy alliance via Kissinger—the arch enemy of the Third World, of the movement of non alignment?

Lastly, before concluding our arguments, it is pertinent to ask why China, if it were really interested in helping the non alignment movement grow, should have chosen some of its members as victims of its cartographic aggression, of brutal armed invasion? Why, at the height of the Caribbean crisis in 1962, did it invade India? Was it Maoist brand of anti imperialism, which Castro was defending against armed threats issued by Washington? Caring little for the friendship India had shown towards China, for the efforts Nehru had made—even at the cost of making enemies of Americans—to get China admitted to the UN, Mao and his cohorts threw all civilised behaviour overboard and sent their armed hordes across the Himalayas obviously to deflect the leader of the non aligned world from his chosen path, to detach India from the non aligned world and then to dominate it from a position of strength.

China also did all it could to help fissiparous and disruptive tendencies grow in India as was evident from the support it gave to rebel Nagas and Mizos, to Pakistan in having Kashmir severed from the rest of India, to a band of ultra 'Leftists' intent on creating anarchy under the slogan of 'Maoist revolution.'

The Third World countries occupy an important place

in the hegemonistic policy of the Maoists. In striving for the leadership of the group of states which, due to their large populations, constitute an overwhelming majority in the international community of nations, Peking hopes to rise to the status of a great power and to become the leader of the third power centre of the world.

Control over the human and material resources of these countries making up the three huge continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America—could change the balance of forces in the world in favour of China. This explains the stubborn desire of the Maoists to gain influence over the developing countries which they consider an important reserve in their struggle for world domination.

Does not this strategy coalesce with Kissinger's? Mao and Kissinger speak different idioms for they come from two different historic milieus, but they attempt at the same objective for they represent two streams flowing from the same spring of hostility to the world of socialism, hostility to the world of non alignment, hostility to their imperishable and everlasting cohesiveness which has withstood and will continue to withstand all severe tests to which they are subjected by Peking and Washington and by both conjointly.

CHAPTER XIII

Prospects and Perspectives

The foregoing pages have borne out that the basic conceptions of non-alignment have suited the larger interests of the countries subscribing to this policy and of the world at large and have been in tune with tendencies which have today matured into peaceful coexistence and detente. Non alignment is not, therefore, a "stranger" to the new emerging structure of international relations. What is important is that far from becoming irrelevant the basic postulates of non-alignment have merged fully with new configuration of world circumstances. Non-alignment has not taken any somersault nor does it need to take one.

Notwithstanding the advent of detente peace remains the deepest aspirations of people everywhere in the world. In this sense, one of the classic objectives of non alignment has not lost its *raison d'être*. As a matter of fact, the movement needs throwing all its influence and full weight in ensuring the durability of peace and the irreversibility of detente. There are powerful international forces still exerting pulls away from the growing trend of detente. Among these may be counted those entrenched vested interests in the West which have drawn nourishment from arms drive and which see in its slowing down a fall in their profit curve. Second

ly, note should be taken of the most bellicose Western politicians who still look at the world through the cold-war blinkers, who have not overgrown the Dullesian mentality of "rolling back" the frontiers of socialism. Thirdly, the Chinese leadership, stoking the fires of regional conflicts wherever they break out, aim at bringing the world close to a crisis-situation from where, they calculate, the two Great Powers will find it impossible to withdraw and thus maul each other to the advantage of Peking. The Chinese press says "The two tigers will fight down in the valley whereas we, the Chinese, will watch them from atop the mountain." In this dangerous gamble the Chinese leaders do not reckon with the calculus of a nuclear war which will engulf the entire world, including the people of China. The non-alignment movement cannot, therefore, overlook that Peking's frantic attempts to torpedo detente, to obstruct disarmament, to sow suspicion and hostility between states, its efforts to provoke a world war and reap whatever advantages may accrue from them, pose a great danger for all peace loving peoples.

The non-aligned countries cannot turn their race away from the world issues endangering peace, e.g., in the Middle East. As External Affairs Minister Mr. Chavan has said, India and the non-aligned group will be glad to make a constructive contribution if called upon to do so. Nor can they rest on their laurels as far as the process of de-colonialisation is concerned. Ugly spots of colonial rule and racial discrimination still exist and they have to be dismantled to yield place to popular rule and equality and justice. Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories, colonialism in parts of Africa and apartheid in South Africa and Rhodesia are reminders that much remains to be done by the non-alignment movement. Furthermore, disarmament, the greatest need of the times, is yet to be achieved. The world is today faced by the peril from nuclear destruction. This has to be eliminated,

the stockpiles destroyed and the world finally taken towards universal and general disarmament

Non alignment, said the Lusaka Declaration of 1970 derives its origins from certain perennial yearnings of nations states for safer, fuller and a better life It would, therefore, remain of abiding significance and was not dependent upon international political circumstances which were likely to change

It was in this sense of a pervading philosophy and method of foreign policy that Jawaharlal Nehru had conceived of non alignment

The first two post war decades until 1965 66 may be said to have seen the grand sweep of the policy of non alignment on the world stage as a struggle for peace and coexistence and as a struggle against colonialism and imperialism No doubt, these struggles continue to remain at the heart of the policy but new problems and challenges have emerged during the last one decade requiring more specific and practical, more sustained and concerted action by the non aligned group The tripartite meeting of President Tito President Nasser and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in New Delhi in 1966, for instance, led to the signing in 1967 of an agreement on Trade Expansion and Economic Cooperation among India Yugoslavia and Egypt Though this tripartite agreement was of a limited arrangement it was conceptionally a significant essay in non aligned economic cooperation The idea of economic cooperation has now become an important and integral part of the international strategy of non alignment India, under Mrs Gandhi's leadership, has played a crucial role in the development of this economic dimension of non alignment during the last ten years or so—

It will not be out of place to refer here briefly to the various measures that India took, together with its non aligned friends to promote economic, commercial and techni

cal cooperation among the non aligned nations One important point to be borne in mind is that what has enabled us to promote this cooperation is the advance we ourselves have made in agricultural, industrial and technological development. Similar developments have taken place in other countries as well which made it possible for the non-aligned group to talk meaningfully of self-reliance and mutual cooperation

If in the fifties and sixties the main thrust of the non-alignment was against the division of the world on the basis of cold war politics endangering global peace as well as the independence of peoples, today it is directed against the iniquitous and explosive division of the world into the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America and the developed countries To narrow down and eventually to bridge this gap and to establish balanced and cooperative relationship between the developing and the developed worlds is a principal objective of non alignment The establishment of a just economic balance between these two categories of nations is essential, not only from the point of view of social justice and human equality, but also for the creation of peaceful and stable world order free from the threat of violent upheavals

The role economic cooperation between the non aligned group and the socialist community played in developing the economies of young states is now admitted by all The USSR has steadfastly come forward in consolidating their independent economy by giving assistance for creating a vast industrial infrastructure as symbolised by Bhilai, Bokaro, Ranchi and other 'modern temples' of new India. The economic relations between the two groups of countries are based on equality and mutuality of advantage

The alliance the non aligned movement has built with the socialist community of nations is acting as a potent

force in restructuring the international economic relations. The developing Afro Asian non aligned countries account, for instance, for ten per cent of foreign trade turnover of socialist countries members of the COMECON. Thousands of enterprises, many of them in the core sector, have been constructed and are under construction in these countries.

The danger of a world war has somewhat receded as a result of the growing detente in the world. As Mr Chavan has pointed out, India has always held the view that in this nuclear age, war as a method of resolving power rivalries has become outmoded and that the development of technology made international cooperation, especially between the Great Powers, necessary and ultimately inescapable.

In the earlier period of detente some people had mistakenly called this policy hi alignment. The fact is that the Indian policy of non alignment, as Mr Chavan has explained, has not been one of equidistance or equal proximity to the great powers. It has been one of promoting international co operation for which detente is indispensable. The joint space flight by the USSR and the USA and the Helsinki Conference on Peace and Cooperation in Europe are historic events in the evolution of international detente.

Today, as yesterday, the non aligned countries have to assert their independence and to concert their efforts in order to be able to withstand pressures from certain powers and to bring about a greater degree of democratisation in international relations.

It is also useful to remember, as Mr Chavan says, that while the system of military pacts has become looser, these pacts have considerable residuary capacity to ignore their existence. The continuance of imperialist military and naval bases in foreign territories and the resumption of arms supplies to client states in sensitive regions of the world pose a

danger to peace and to the independence of non aligned countries. Thus, the classic objective of non alignment to preserve national independence in the context of global or regional military alliances remains relevant. Non alignment cannot be ignored while we welcome and applaud the retreat of military alliances and the forward movement of international detente.

The forthcoming non aligned summit is expected to reinforce the basic principles of the non aligned movement and resist efforts to dilute these. Various kinds of pressures are sought to be applied on non aligned countries by forces of imperialism, colonialism and foreign domination which were resorting to such methods as destabilisation and internal subversion. These forces were trying to divide and weaken the non aligned movement and divert the attention of non aligned countries from important issues of development, peace and cooperation.

The Foreign Ministers of India and Yugoslavia, in a joint communique stressed the need for preserving and further strengthening the unity, solidarity and cohesiveness of the non aligned countries and in this context reiterated their 'full support for strict adherence to the fundamental principles of non alignment'.

The main thrust of the forthcoming Colombo summit, they affirmed, should be on "an integrated and balanced approach" to the problems of detente, disarmament, development and cooperation both on the international plane and in the fields of the development of relations among non aligned countries themselves.

People of the world will look towards the Colombo Conference for the lead it gives in reinvigorating the world process, inexorably moving towards the restructuring of international relations peace and detente. India under the ins-

piring leadership of Mrs Gandhi will reiterate and reaffirm the basic doctrines of non alignment Nehru had evolved and rededicated itself to the cause of further carrying them forward and developing them in the changed world events in the interests of world peace and independence of peoples, for international security and cooperation among nations

by Nehru, Nasser and Seokarno, and the general tone of its declaration set at the conference was certainly of the non aligned nations. It gave them an opportunity to meet, discuss and evolve common understanding on world affairs.

The outbreak of the Suez crisis in 1956 gave the non aligned nations another occasion to demonstrate their opposition to tripartite aggression. The indignant and united voice of the non aligned nations, supported by other socialist countries, was largely responsible to save Egypt from aggression.

A large number of Afro-Asian nations had received, in this period, active support from Soviet Union on questions of vital national importance. India, for example, received open support on questions of Kashmir and Goa, Indonesia on West Irian issue, and Egypt at the time of Suez crisis.

During the following years, the non aligned nations were consistently seeking to embody their broad assumptions about international relations in actual policies. In urging the liquidation of colonialism from all parts of the world, notably in Algeria and Angola, in attempting to achieve through the UN and its associated bodies, peaceful solutions to international problems, and aid to underdeveloped states for their development programme, in opposing the racist policies pursued by certain nations within their territories, and in urging disarmament and banning of destructive nuclear weapons, the non aligned nations tried to operate as a catalyst international force.

The next important stage was the holding of summit conferences. The non aligned nations were now holding their own conferences. The number of participants went on increasing from 25 at Belgrade to 76 at Algiers. The forthcoming summit at Colombo, the first to be held in Asia, is expected to be attended by over 80 countries. The Government's leadership declared in September



1946 non alignment as the basis of its approach to contemporary international relations, India was practically the only country in the world to pursue that policy. Today, the number of non aligned nations has considerably increased. This tremendous growth has been from one main source—the new states of Asia and Africa, some of whom had declared non alignment as their policy at the Bandung Conference. The liberation of these countries had been won on the basis of nationalism which, as indicated earlier, was the major social phenomenon in the emergence of non alignment.

The real basis of the strength of non alignment can be seen in the colossal popular basis which the policy enjoys, not only in those countries where non alignment is pursued as official foreign policy, but also in a number of other countries in the underdeveloped world, in Latin American countries and in liberal circles in more advanced countries of Europe like Britain, Norway, Sweden, etc. In the developing countries it is not accidental that governments which actively pursue non alignment are also governments which enjoy a large popular base as in India.

Another reason for further growth of non alignment during these years was due to the gradual evolution of its implications. Certain general propositions were derived at the beginning itself. These were largely inherent in the political experiences of these nations joined in the immediate past as a result of their opposition to colonialism and racialism, organising international assistance for economic development of the undeveloped and underdeveloped ones, urge for peace and disarmament and support to the UN. While there were a number of issues on which the non aligned nations felt some difficulty in taking a definite stand from the very beginning because it required sometimes both time and experience for them to define their policies on a number of issues.

Another measure for the growth of non alignment was